111

MISCELLANIES OF DIVINITIE

Divided into three books,

Wherein is explained at large the estate of the Soul in her origination, separation, particular judgement, and conduct to eternall blisse or torment.

BY EDWARD KELLET
Doctour in Divinitie, and one of the Canons of the Cathedrall Church of EXON.

S. AUGUST. serm. nov. 24. de S. Paulo.

¶ *Omnibus hominibus natis constituit Deus mortem, per quam de isto seculo emigrent. Exceptus eris à morte, si exceptus fueris à genere humano.—— Iam homo es, venisti: Quomodo hinc exeas, cogita.*



Printed by the Printers to the *Vniversitie* of CAMBRIDGE, and are to be sold by *Robert Allot*, at the Beare in *Pauls*-Church-yard. 1635.

BRITISH MUSEUM

TO
THE MOST REVEREND FATHER IN GOD, MY VERY GOOD LORD, THE LORD

Archbiſhop of CANTERBURIE his Grace,
Primate of all ENGLAND,
and Metropolitane.

Moſt Reverend,

THE manifold graces which God hath plentifully poured on you, enabling you, even from your youth, to be a fit inſtrument divers wayes to advance his glorie, and bleſsing your great good labours with the favourable acceptance of our dread Soveraigne & State and all who have well-wiſhing unto this our Sion, have cauſed me,

me, a crazie, old, retired man, who never ſaw you but once, and that long ſince, to leave behinde me a teſtimoniall to the world, both of my heartie thanks to God, that you have been; & of my humbleſt prayers, that you may long continue a prop of our Church, a favoured Ezra, the prompt Scribe in the Law; a powerfull Aaron, to make an atonement for the people, an Elijah, zealous in your calling; a provident guide to the Prophets, to the ſonnes and ſchools of the Prophets; a father, chariot, & horſemen of Iſrael, as Eliſha called Elijah, & as king Joaſh called Eliſha. May heavenly influences and divine irradiations ſay, Amen, Amen.

Your Graces in all dutie,

Edward Kellet.

The Contents.

The Contents of the first book.

CHAPTER. I.

Sect. 1. *THe ſubject of the whole work. The reaſon why I choſe the text of* Hebr. 9. 27. *to diſcourſe upon. The Diviſion of it.* Fol. 1. &c.

2. *Amphibologie prejudiciall to truth. Death appointed by God, yet for Adams fault. The tree of life kept from Adam, not by phantaſticall Hob-goblins, but by true Angels, and a flaming ſword brandiſhing it ſelf. Leviticall ceremonies dead, buried, deadly. Things redeemed diſpenſed with; yet ſtill appointed.* 2

3. *The Kingdome of Death reigning over all. Bodily death here meant, and onely once to be undergone.* 4

4. Μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο *implieth not neceſſarily the longinquitie of future times intercurrent; but rather a demonſtration that other things were precedent.* Τὸ After *doth often ſignifie an immediate ſucceſſion. Judgement here taken for an act of juſtice.* 5

5. *The generall judgement here underſtood by* OEcumenius *and Bellarmine. The ſecond book of Eſdras apocryphall, and juſtly refuſed. More then the generall judgement is meant. Even the particular judgement alſo is avouched by many authorities. Three queſtions ariſing from the former part of theſe words.* 6

CHAP. II.

1. *HOw God is immortall; how Angels and the ſouls of men; how Adams bodie was mortall, and yet immortall, though compounded of contraries.* 10

2. *Ariſtotles laſt words; his death. Holcot, or the Philoſophers pray for him. Ariſtotle canonized by his followers. Plato and Ariſtotle compared. Vives taxed. Adams bodie was not framed of the earth, or duſt of Paradiſe.* 12

3. *Adam ſhould not have been ſubject to any externall force; he was lord of the creatures: inward diſtemper he could not have. Adams bodily temperature: Chriſts, who was fairer then the children of Adam: the helps for Adams bodie, meat, drink, and ſleep* 17

4. *Divers opinions of the tree of life. If Adam had eaten of the tree of life before or after his fall he had lived for ever. If he had not ſinned, he had not died, though he had not taſted of the tree of life.*

The Contents.

To what use the tree of life should have served: 20

5. *The Councel of Millan: Cardinall Cajetan, Richeomus the Jesuit, Julianus Pomerius and Saint Augustine think that Adam could not have died, if he had not sinned. The book of Wisedome, Holcot, Doctour Estius, and two passages of Scripture Canonicall, are authorities evincing that Adam had in the state of innocencie an immortall bodie.* 24

CHAP. III.

1. *Death is a bitter-sweet. Enoch and Elias Raptures were not painfull to them. Christs transfiguration and the manner of it. That it was not painfull to him. Adams translation to a life celestiall and a bodie spirituall, should not have been painfull, if he had not sinned. They who shall be changed at Christs coming, shall by it finde no pain. Death is painfull.* 28
2. *Man-kinde died the first minute of their sinne. God draweth good out of evil. Death in some regard is changed from a punishment to be a favour and blessing of God.* 31
3. *Not many or more sinnes, but one caused death. One onely. David begotten in lawfull wedlock. That this one sinne is not lesse in the godly, nor greater in the wicked. Death was appointed for one sinne onely, of one person onely.* 33
4. *This one person onely was man: this man that sinned that one sinne was Adam. Strange and curious speculations, that Eve sinned not that sinne for which mankinde was appointed to death.* 36
5. *Two School-speculations propounded. The second handled at large, as expounding the former; and determined against the School-men themselves, viz.* That the children of innocent Adam had been born confirm'd in grace. *The censure of Vives upon these and the like points. A part of his censure censured.* 43

CHAP. IIII.

1. *Adams perfection in innocencie. Our imperfection after his fall, contrary to his, both in understanding and will, and in the parts concupiscible and irascible.* 55
2. *Adam had other laws given him: but one above all, and one onely concerning posteritie.* 57
3. *What this law was. Adam knew the danger to himself and his offspring. The first sinne was against this law.* 58
4. *Eve sinned before. How she sinned the same, and not the same sinne with Adam.* 60
5. *Zeno, the Stoicks, and Jovinian confuted. Sinnes are not equally sinfull.* 62
6. *Adam sinned farre more and worse then Eve.* 65
7. *This sinne of Adam was not uxoriousnesse, as Scotus maintained; but disobedience or pride. The branches of Adams sinne.* 66

CHAP.

The Contents.

CHAP. V.

1. ORiginall sinne is an obscure point. The errours of the Schoolmen concerning it. The over-sight of Bellarmine. 73
2. Originall sinne described by its causes: Distinguished from Adams actuall sinne. 77
3. In what sense Adam had, and his posteritie hath Originall sinne. We were in Adam. He stood for us idealiter. Every one of us would have done exactly as Adam did. We did sinne in Adam, and how. 78
4. Whether Christ was in Adam, and how. 82
5. We sinned not that sinne in Adam, by imitation onely. 84
6. Adams sinne, as personall, was not imputed. Adam is saved. Adams actuall sinne, as it was ideall, and representative, is imputed to us. 85

CHAP. VI.

1. ORiginall sinne is propagated unto us. Originall sinne properly is not in the flesh before the union with the soul. 90
2. Bishop Bilson, Mollerus, Kemnitius, and Luther, in an errour. Bishop Bilsons arguments answered. Conception taken strictly by Physicians, &c. We are not conceived in originall sinne, if we respect this conception. Conception taken largely by Divines. Thus we were conceived in sinne. 92
3. A Physicall Tractate of conception clearing the point. 97
4. A Discourse touching aborsives and abortives. Balthasar Bambach answered. The Hebrew vowels not written at first when the consonants were. Never any wrote till God had written the Two Tables. 98
5. The manner how the soul contracteth originall sinne pointed at. Bodily things may work upon the soul. 103
6. Righteous men have unrighteous children. The contagion of originall sinne is quickly spread. 106
7. No sinne or sinnes of any of our parents immediate or mediate do hurt the souls of their children, but onely one, and that the first sinne of Adam. 109

CHAP. VII.

1. A Review of the last point. Zanchius not against it. Bucer and Martyr are but faint, and rather negative then positive. 112
2. Bucer and Martyr make the state of the question to be voluble, not fixt and setled. Their objections answered. The place of Exodus 20. 5. examined. 113
3. S. Augustine appealed unto, and defended. 116
4. God justly may, and doth punish with any temperall punishment, any children like or unlike unto their parents, for their parents personall sinnes. 118

The Contents.

5. *God doth, and may justly punish some children eternally, and all temporally for originall sinne, whether they be like their parents in actuall aversion, yea or no.* 121
6. *God justly punisheth, even eternally, wicked children, if they resemble wicked parents.* ibid.
7. *God oftentimes punisheth one sinne with another.* ibid.
8. *The personall holinesse of the parent, never conveyed grace or salvation to the sonne.* ibid.
9. *God never punished eternally the reall iniquities of the fathers upon their children, if the children were holy.* ibid.
10. *No personall sinnes can be communicated. The point handled at large against the errour of Bucer and Martyr.* 123
11. *The arguments or authorities for my opinion. The new Writers not to be overvalued. Zanchius himself is against Bucer and Martyr.* 133

CHAP. VIII.

1. *ORiginall sinne came not by the law of Moses, but was before it in the world.* 138
2. *God hath good reason and justice to punish us for our originall sinne in Adam. Gods actions defended by the like actions of men.* 139
3. *Husbands represent their wives. The men of Israel represented the women. Concerning the first-born of men and beasts. The primogeniture and redemption of the first-born.* 140
4. *The whole bodie is punished for the murder committed by one hand. Corporations represent whole cities and towns, and Parliaments the bodie of the Realm. Their acts binde the whole Kingdome. Battelling champions and duellists ingage posteritie.* 144
5. *S. Peter represented the Apostles. The Apostles represent sometimes the Bishops, sometimes the whole Clergie. The Ministers of the Convocation represent the whole Church of England. The authoritie of Generall Councels. Nationall Synods must be obeyed.* 147
6. *Private spirits censured. Interpretation of Scripture not promiscuously permitted. An Anabaptisticall woman displayed.* 149
7. *Another woman reproved for her new-fangled book in print. Scriptures not to be expounded by anagrams in Hebrew, much lesse in English; but with reverence. How farre the people are to beleeve their Pastours.* 152
8. *Saul represented an entire armie. Joshua and the Princes binde the Kingdome of Israel for long time after.* 183
9. *Christ represented us. Christ and Adam like in some things, in others unlike. Christ did and doth more good for us then Adam did harm.* 184

THE

The Contents.

The Contents of the ſecond book.

CHAPTER I.

Sect. 1. *THe queſtion propounded, and explained.* Fol. 1.
2. *Armenius, or rather his ſonne Zoroaſter, dead, and revived.* ibid.
3. *Antillus dead, and living again, becauſe the meſſenger of death miſtook him, in ſtead of Nicandas: Nicandas died in his ſtead.* 2
4. *A careleſſe Chriſtian died, and recovered life: lived an Anchorite twelve yeares: died religiouſly.* ibid.

CHAP. II.

1. *A Diviſion of ſuch as have been raiſed. They all died.* 3
2. *The widow of Zarephath her ſonne raiſed, yet died again: ſuppoſed to be Jonas the Prophet. The Shunammites ſonne raiſed, not to an eternall, but to a temporary reſurrection. A good, and a better reſurrection.* 4
3. *Chriſt the firſt who roſe, not to die again.* 5
4. *The man raiſed in the ſepulchre of Eliſha, aroſe not to immortalitie.* ibid.

CHAP. III.

1. *WHileſt Chriſt lived, none raiſed any dead ſave himſelf onely.* 6
2. *The rulers daughter raiſed by Chriſt, died again.* ibid.
3. *So did the young man whom Chriſt recalled to life.* 7
4. *Many miracles in that miracle of Lazarus his reſurrection.* ibid.
5. *Chriſt gave perfect health to thoſe whom he healed or raiſed.* 8
6. *Lazarus his holy life, and his ſecond death.* 9

CHAP. IIII.

1. *TAbitha died again.* 9
2. *So did Eutychus.* 10
3. *They who were raiſed about the Paſsion of Chriſt, died not again; as many ancient and late Writers do imagine.* Mr. Montague *is more reſerved.* ibid.

The Contents.

CHAP. V.

1. WHo were *ſuppoſed to be the Saints which were raiſed, by ſuch as maintain that they accompanied Chriſt into heaven.* 12
2. *A ſtrange ſtorie out of the Goſpel of the Nazarens.* ibid.
3. *Adams ſoul was ſaved. Adams bodie was raiſed about Chriſts Paſsion, ſaith Pineda out of diverſe Fathers: Thus farre Pineda hath truth by him. That the ſepulchre of Adam was on mount Calvarie: ſo ſay Athanaſius, Origen, Cyprian, Ambroſe, Baſil, Epiphanius, Chryſoſtom, Auguſtine, Euthymius, Anaſtaſius Sinaita, Germanus Patriarch of Conſtantinople.* ibid.
4. *It was applauded in the Church in Hieromes time.* 13
5. *Theophylact thought Adam buried in Calvarie. Druſius unadviſedly taxeth the Fathers. Tertullian conſenteth with other Fathers, and Nonnus, who is defended againſt Heinſius.* 14
6. *At Jeruſalem they now ſhew the place where Adams head was found. Moſes Barcepha ſaith, that Sem after the floud buried the head of Adam.* 17
7. *The Romane ſtorie of Tolus, and Capitolium, much reſembling the ſtorie of Adam.* ibid.

CHAP. VI.

1. HIerom *ſaith, Adam was not buried on mount Calvarie. Both Hierom, Adrichomius, and Zimenes ſay, he was buried in Hebron. Hierom cenſured, for doubling in this point, by Bellarmine.* 19
2. *Hieroms arguments anſwered.* 20
3. *The Originall defended againſt Hierom in Joſh.* 14. 15. ADAM *there is not a proper name, but an appellative.* Arba *is there is a proper name of a man. Adrichomius erreth in* Kiriath-Arbee; *and the words ſignifie not* Civitas quatuor virorum, The citie of foure men. *New expoſitions of* Kiriath-Arbee. ibid.
4. *It may ſignifie as well* Civitas quatuor rerum, The citie of foure things: *as,* Quatuor hominum, Of foure men. *The memorable monuments about Hebron.* 22
5. *It may be interpreted* Civitas quadrata, quadrilatera, quadrimembris, quadricollis; A citie foureſquare, of foure ſides, of foure parts, of foure hills. 23
6. *If* Kiriath-Arba *doth ſignifie the citie of foure men, yet they might be other men, beſides the foure Patriachs.* 24
7. *If it had its denomination from foure Patriarchs, and from their buriall there, yet Adam is none of them.* 25
8. *Auguſtine peremptorie for Adams buriall in Calvarie; and Paula and Euſtochium, or rather Hierom.* 26
9. *Another objection anſwered. The Jews never ſhewed extraordinary*

The Contents.

nary honour to Adam, or Noah; but to Abraham, and others after him. Druſius preferreth the reading uſed by our late tranſlation, Hoſ.6.7. *before the Genevean and Tremellian.* 27

CHAP. VII.

1. *THough Adam was buried on Calvarie, as Pineda ſaith; yet his proofs are weak, that Adam was raiſed with Chriſt, and went bodily into heaven with him. The cited place of Athanaſius proveth onely Adams buriall there. Origen, in the place cited, is againſt Pineda. Auguſtine is palpably falſified.* 29
2. *Adams skull ſhewed lately at Jeruſalem.* 30
3. *Dionyſius Carthuſianus ſaith, Eve then aroſe. His opinion is without proof.* ibid.
4. *Nor Abraham then aroſe.* ibid.
5. *Nor Iſaac then aroſe, whatſoever Pineda affirmeth.* 31

CHAP. VIII.

1. *PIneda his phanſie, that Jacob then was raiſed.* 33
2. *The reaſon, why the Patriarchs deſired the tranſlation of their bones, was not, to riſe with Chriſt, as Pineda opineth; but upon other grounds, and to other ends.* ibid.
3. *Where Joſeph was firſt buried, where ſecondly.* 34
4. *The great difficultie of* Act. 7. 16. *propounded. Two anſwers diſliked. The originall is not corrupt.* 35
5. *Beza taxed for imputing corruption to the originall, on* Mat. 13. 35. *and on* Luk. 22. 20. *and on* Matth. 27. 9. *All theſe places defended, and the ſacred Majeſtie of Scripture vindicated from criticiſme. Many good anſwers to* Matth. 27. 9. *Eraſmus faulty with Beza.* 36
6. *S. Auguſtine and Cyrill againſt them.* 40
7. *Maſius and Junius prefer the Arabick and Syriack before the Greek. Junius recanteth. A little errour may (perhaps) be aſcribed to the Tranſcribers. A generall errour in Greek and Latine may not be admitted in all copies of Scriptures.* ibid.

CHAP. IX.

1. *THe ſecond anſwer diſliked. Melchior Canus cenſured for ſaying, S. Steven his memorie failed him. His like proof from Jephthah his miſtaking, anſwered.* 42
2. *Another argument of his, from* Matth. 2. 6. *anſwered.* 44
3. *Heinſius touched at, Cuſanus rejected, for holding that Adam could have underſtood all languages now in uſe. The manner of the confuſion of tongues at Babel.* ibid.
4. *The Orientall languages, a goodly ornament, and neceſſary in ſome places. The Syriack enlightening the Greek.* 48

5. *The*

The Contents.

5. *The* Jewiſh *excommunications. Donations to Religious houſes ſealed up with curſes to the infringers. Mr Selden in part defended, though his Hiſtorie of Tithes hath done hurt. MARAN-ATHA. The Amphibologie of* Act. 3. 21. *cleared by the Syriack. Ubiquitaries with Illyricus taxed. Heavens, and Heaven, taken for God.* ibid.

6. *Heinſius ſtrictly examined, and rejected.* 54

7. *Things granted,* viz. The *inſpirations and conceptions of holy Pen-men were under one or other language: in which conceptions they could not erre; nor could they erre in writing.* 57

8. *Queſtions handled at large: Whether it were neceſſary that the Scripture ſhould be written: Whether the ſacred writers wrote caſually. Whether they were commanded to write: Whether they were compelled to write: Whether they underſtood all that they wrote: Whether they did reade profane Authours: Whether they ſtudied the things before hand.* 68

9. *Concluſions againſt Heinſius. There was no difference between the Pen-men of the Divine writ of the Old and New Teſtament, in the point of conceiving and writing in different languages. We are not to have recourſe to the thoughts of S. John, rather then his words. They had no libertie left them, to put in their own conceits, or in writing to adde or blot out what they had done. They had no libertie to cloath their inward apprehenſions with words of their own. They did not conceive in one language, and write in another.* 95

CHAP. X.

1. *REall truth in the Greek and Latine texts of* Act. 7. 16. *The place expounded thus,* The Fathers were not Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob; but the twelve ſonnes of Jacob. 112

2. *Theſe twelve Fathers were not buried in* Abrahemio, *but in* Sychem. 114

3. Abraham *in this place is not taken* properly, *but* patronymicé. ibid.

4. Τῷ Συχέμ *uſed by S. Stephen, amphibolous, and expounded.* 116

5. *Two opinions concerning the place of* Acts 7. 16. *propounded.* 117

6. *The laſt preferred.* 118

CHAP. XI.

1. *PIneda makes Moſes to be one of the raiſed at Chriſts Paſſion, if once he died. Pineda cenſured for his aſſertion, or rather his* hypotheſis. 119

2. *David then aroſe in Pineda his judgement.* 120
3. *His argument anſwered. Biſhop* Bilſon *wavering, and rejected, as he rejecteth S. Auguſtine.* ibid.
4. *A demonſtration (upon S. Auguſtine his ground, and Act. 2. 24.) that David was not raiſed, nor aſcended bodily into heaven.* 122
5. *Davids ſepulchre now kept by the Turk.* 123

CHAP. XII.

1. *Pineda doubteth whether Ananias, Azarias, and Miſael, were raiſed at Chriſts paſſion; becauſe there now are ſaid to be ſome reliques of them;* ſome at Rome, and ſome at Venice, *ſaith Lorinus.* 124
2. *Other reliques. The table at which Chriſt ate with his Apoſtles. Some hairs, ſaid to be the hairs of our glorious Saviour: others, of his all-gracious mother. A bone of Philips. A ſandall of S. Peters.* 125
3. *S. Peters chain miraculous, as they report.* ibid.
4. *M'. Mountague, now the reverend Biſhop of Chicheſter, defended.* ibid.
5. *S. Pauls chain alſo miraculous, from Gregorie & Bellarmine.* 126
6. *Falſe reliques taxt by Eraſmus and Calvin. John the Baptiſt* Τετράκαλος, *ſuppoſed to have three heads at the leaſt. Three or foure prepuces of Chriſt.* ibid.
7. *Reliques before Chriſts time. The ark. The holy oyl. The rod of Moſes and Aaron. The throne of Eternitie phanſied by the Jews. The horns of Moſes. One finger of the holy Ghoſt. The Papiſts faults in forging of falſe reliques.* 128
8. *All Reliques are not falſe. What reſpects are to be denied to true Reliques:* 130
9. *What are to be given.* 131
10. *No likelihood of the raiſing up of Ananias, Azarias, and Miſael, about Chriſts paſsion.* 132

CHAP. XIII.

1. *Pineda ſaith, Jonas aroſe then, and Noah. His reaſons very ſhallow.* 133
2. *Daniel aroſe, ſaith Pineda from Nicetas. If Daniel aroſe, he aroſe but with one leg: the other leg is yet ſhewed at Vercellis.* ibid.
3. *Job aroſe now, ſaith Pineda. His proof lame. Jobs Epitaph poeticall. His ſepulchrall* pyramis *made of imagination.* 134
4. *Job ſhall ariſe at the generall judgement. Pineda wrincheth the Scripture.* ibid.
5. *The end of Jobs book, according to ſome Greek copies: a double expoſition of the words.* 135
6. *Jobs bodie ſuppoſed to be tranſlated to Conſtantinople.* ibid.
7. *Bartholomæus Sibylla ſaith, S. Hierom is expreſſe, that the holy*

mother of our Lord, and John the Evangeliſt, are bodily aſcended. The like cited from Aquinas. And Holcot ſaith, That the glorious virgins bodie was not to be incinerated. Her ſuppoſed day of Aſſumption, moſt honoured among the Papiſts: and yet there is monſtrous diſagreeing among them who favour her Aſſumption. The laſt inſtances concern not our queſtion. ibid.

8. *Pineda preſumed too farre upon uncertainties. Lorinus dareth not name any particularly that were raiſed. It cannot be known certainly.* 136

CHAP. XIIII.

1. MY *conjecture, that none of the Patriarchs or old Prophets were raiſed.* 137
2. *An objection, concerning Peters knowing of Moſes and Elias on mount Tabor, anſwered.* ibid.
3. *A conjecture that the Saints who lived in Chriſts time, and died before him, were raiſed at his Paſſion: Who they were in moſt likelihood. When Joſeph, the reputed father of Chriſt, did die.* 138
4. *The end, why they were raiſed. To whom they appeared.* 139
5. *A crotchet concerning the wives of dead men which have been raiſed.* 140

CHAP. XV.

1. THe *raiſed Saints aſcended not into heaven with Chriſt; as is proved by Scripture, and reaſon. Suarez his ſhallow anſwer. Epiphanius ſtrengthening my former poſitive conjectures.* 141
2. *If the raiſed aſcended bodily into heaven, the Patriarchs ſhould not be left behinde.* 142
3. *The aſcending bodily of the Saints into heaven, not neceſſarie or behooffull.* ibid.
4. *Onely Chriſts bodie was ſeen aſcending.* 143
5. *In likelihood, Chriſt would have ſhewed the Patriarchs unto ſome of his Apoſtles.* ibid.

CHAP. XVI.

1. ANgels *taken for men. Angels repreſenting men, are called men.* 144
2. The name JEHOVAH aſcribed to an Angel repreſenting JEHOVAH, *ſay Eſtius and Thyræus. Picking of faults in the Apocryphall Scriptures, to be abhorred.* ibid.
3. *Druſius his povertie. The Apocrypha is too little eſteemed. The Angel, who guided young Tobie, defended.* 145
4. *The great difference between Chriſts manner of riſing, and Lazarus his.* 146

CHAP.

The Contents.

CHAP. XVII.

1. THe place of Matth. 27.53. is diverſly pointed; and, according to the pointing, is the diverſitie of meaning. The firſt implieth, that the Saints aroſe with Chriſt, though their graves were opened before. This interpretation is not ſo likely, though received generally. 148
2. The ſecond inferreth, that they aroſe before Chriſt, though they went not into the citie, till after his reſurrection. This is favoured by the Syriack, and is more agreeable to reaſon. ibid.
3. That the raiſed Saints died again, proved by reaſons, and Heb. 11.40. 149
4. Chriſt the firſt-fruits of the dead, and of the raiſed. Angelicall aſſumed bodies were ſeen and heard; much rather ſhould mens bodies aſcending with Chriſt. 150
5. S. Auguſtine, Aquinas, Hierom, Chryſoſtom, Theophylact, Euthymius, Proſper, Soto, Salmeron, Barradius, Pererius, Valentian, affirm that the raiſed Saints died again. Franciſcus Lucas Brugenſis holds it likely. 151

CHAP. XVIII.

1. THe arguments of the contrarie opinion anſwered. Suarez, and eſpecially Cajetan, cenſured. 152
2. That by the holy Citie, Jeruſalem below was meant, proved at large. Joſephus and the Jews erring about the name of Jeruſalem. Hierom uncertain. 154
3. How the raiſed appeared. A difference between appearing as men; And appearing as newly raiſed men. Franciſcus Lucas Brugenſis rejected. 156
4. An argument of Maldonat anſwered by the prodigious Legend of Chriſtina, who died twice. No hurt is to man, if God will ſend his ſoul from an heavenly place, to live a while on earth again. 157
5. No harm to die twice. The difference between death compleat and incompleat. 159
6. God can diſpenſe with his own laws. 160

CHAP. XIX.

1. STrange conceits concerning Nero, from Suetonius, Tacitus, Hierom, Auguſtine. Nero ſuppoſed to be Antichriſt. 161
2. Another incredible relation of the Armenian, who is ſaid to have lived at Chriſts paſſion. The Armenians have their holy frauds. ibid.

The Contents of the third book.

CHAPTER I.

Sect. 1. MAny Papists are very peremptorie, that all and every one must die. Melchior Canus is more moderate. The words are onely indefinite, not universall. 165

2. Objections brought to prove, that universally all shall die. Their answers. Generall rules have exception. Even many learned Papists have acknowledged so much. The point handled, especially against Bellarmine. 166

3. Indefinites have not the force of universals. Even universals are restrained. 169

4. Salmeron bringeth many objections to prove an absolute necessitie that every one shall die. All his objections answered. Mans living in miserie is a kinde of death. ibid.

CHAP. II.

1. THe third question resumed, Whether every one must die? The second part of the answer unto it, That some have been excepted, as Enoch and Elias. The controversie hath been exquisitely handled by King James, and Bishop Andrews. 173

2. Bellarmines third demonstration, that Antichrist is not yet come, propounded. The place of Malachi 4. 5. expounded by Bishop Andrews: and enlarged by my additions. The Papists objection answered. 174

3. The place of Ecclesiasticus 48. 10. concerning Elias examined. 178

4. Another place of Ecclesiasticus 44. 16. concerning Enoch, handled at large against Bellarmine. Enoch was never any notorious sinner, in some mens opinions: Others, otherwise. Their arguments for both opinions are onely probable; and answered. My opinion: and it confirmed. Some think Enoch died. Strange and various opinions concerning S. John the Evangelist, his living, death, and miraculous grave. More miracles, or else mistakings, in the Temples, of Christs Sepulchre, and his Assumption, about Jerusalem. S. John did die. Enoch did not die, but

is living. Mine own opinion of the place Geneſ. 5. 24. Et non ipſe: *and it confirmed. A compariſon between Enochs, Elijahs, and Chriſts aſcenſion. The poſture and circumſtances of Chriſts aſcending.* 180

5. *Bellarmine and others ſay, Paradiſe is now extant: In the earth, or in the aire, ſaith Lapide the Jeſuit. The old tranſlation cenſured. The heaven, into which Enoch and Elias were carried, was not* Aërium *nor* Cœleſte; *but* Supercœleſte. *The earthly Paradiſe is not extant, as it was. Salianus with others ſay truely, The materiall remaineth, not the formall:* Supereſt quoad Eſſentiam, non quoad Ornatum: *The* Place *is not removed, but the* Pleaſure, *and* Amenitie. *Salianus his groſſe errour, That Enoch and Elias are kept by Angels, within the bounds of old Paradiſe on earth.* 194

6. *Enoch ſhall never die, as is proved from* Hebr. 11. 5. *Three evaſions in anſwer to that place, confuted. Melchizedech, and ſtrange things of him. The Eaſt-Indian language hath great affinitie with the Hebrew. An errour of moment in Guilielmus Poſtellus Barentonius. Elias was not burnt by that fire which rapted him.* Soul and bodie concur to make a man, *ſaith Auguſtine from the great Marcus Varro. Vives taxed. Moſes at the transfiguration, appeared in his own bodie. An idle conceit of Bellarmine, concerning Moſes his face; and good obſervations of Origen upon that point. It is probable, that Elias was changed at his rapture, and had then a glorified bodie. An humane ſoul may poſsibly be in a mortall bodie in the third heaven. Corah, Dathan, and Abiram, are in their bodies in hell, properly ſo called; and alive in the hell of the damned. Ribera and Viegas confuted. Our Doctour Raynolds was not in the right in this matter. Some kinde of proofs, That Enoch and Elias are in glorificd bodies in heaven. The place of* Revel. 11. 7. *concerning the two Witneſſes, winnowed by Biſhop Andrews. Enoch and Elias are not thoſe two witneſſes.* 200

CHAP. III.

1. *Some others hereafter ſhall be excepted from death. The* change *may be accounted, in a generall large ſenſe, a kinde of* death. *The Papiſts will have a reall proper death: Aquinas, an incineration. This is diſproved* 1. Theſſal. 4. 17. *which place is handled at large. The rapture of the godly is* ſine media morte, without death. *The reſurrection is of all together. The righteous prevent not the wicked, in that.* 224

2. *By the words of the Creed is proved, that ſome ſhall never die. The ſame is confirmed by other places of Scripture; with the conſent of S. Auguſtine, and Cajetan. The definitions* Eccleſiaſticorum dogmatum, of the ſentences and tenents of the

Church, *leave the words doubtfully. Rabanus his expoſition rejected.* 227

3. *The place of S. Paul,* 2. Corinth. 5. 4. *evinceth, That ſome ſhall not die. Cajetan with us, and againſt Aquinas. Doctour Eſtius, and Cornelius à Lapide the Jeſuit, approve Cajetan. S. Auguſtine is on our ſide; and evinceth it by Adams eſtate before the fall; which ſtate Bellarmine denieth not. Salmerons objections anſwered.* 228

4. *Some ſhall be exempted from death, as is manifeſted* 1. Corinth. 15. 51. *The place fully explicated. The common Greek copies preferred. The Greek reading* πάντες μὲν οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα, We ſhall not all ſleep, *ſtandeth with all truth, conveniencie, probabilitie, and ſenſe. The other Greek* πάντες μὲν οὖν κοιμηθησόμεθα, We ſhall therefore all of us ſleep, *and the more different Vulgat,* Omnes quidem reſurgemus, ſed non omnes immutabimur, Indeed we ſhall all ariſe, but we ſhall not all be changed, *juſtly exploded, as adverſe to ſenſe.* 230

5. *The Pelagians, though accurſed hereticks, yet held truely, That ſome ſhall not die. S. Auguſtine dubious. Others ſtick in his heſitancie. Yet other Fathers and late Writers are conſtant, That ſome ſhall be priviledged from death; yet, that* change *may be called a kinde of* death. 235

FINIS.

A Catalogue of the ſeverall Authours quoted in theſe three books of *MISCELLANIES.*

A

ABen Ezra.
Abraham de Balmis.
Abulenſis.
Adrichomius.
Cornelius Agrippa.
Albericus Gentilis.
Albertus Magnus.
Alchabitius.
Alexander ab Alexandro.
Ambroſius.
Biſhop Andrews.
Anſelmus.
Apollinaris.
Appianus Alexandrinus.
Aquila.
Aquinas.
Petronius Arbiter.
Arboreus.
Franciſcus Aretinus.
Aretius.
Arias Montanus.
Ariſtoteles.
Athanaſius.
Avenarius.
Auguſtinus.

B

BAlthaſar Bambach.
Moſes Bar Cepha.
Baronius.
Barradius.
Baſilius.
Beda.
Bellarminus.
Bernardus.
Bertram.
Beza.
Bilſon.
Boëtius.
Bolducus.
Bonaventura.
Boſquier.
Brentius.
Broughton.
Lucas Brugenſis.
Bucer.
Bullinger.
Buſæus.

C

COelius ſecundus Curio.
Cæſaris commentaria.
Cajetanus.
Calvinus.
Melchior Canus.
Carafa.
Carthuſianus.
Caſaubonus.
Caſſander.
Caſſiodorus.
Catharinus.
Centuriatores.
Cevallerius.
Chaldee Targum.
Chriſtopher Caſtrenſis.
Chryſoſtomus.
Cicero.
Clemens Romanus.
Clemens Alexandrinus.
Joannes Climachus.
Philip de Comines.
Concilium Elibertinum.
Concilium Milevetanum.
Franciſcus Collius.
Coverdale.
Cuſanus.
Cyprianus.
Cyrillus Alexandrinus.

D

DAmianus à Goës.
Rabbi David.
Del Rio.
Demoſthenes.
Petrus Diaconus.
Didymus.
Dionyſius Areopagita.
Dorotheus.
Druſius.
Andreas Dudithius.
Durandus.

E

ELias Levita.
Epimenides.
Epiphanius.
Erafmus.
Eſpencæus.
Eſtius.
Eugubinus.
Euſebius.
Euſtathius Antiochenus.
Euthymius.

F

FAber Stapulenſis.
Feliſius.

Felisius.
Fernelius.
Ferus.
Festus.
Feuardentius.
Dr. Field.
Dr. Fox.
Fulgentius.
Dr. Fulk.

G

Gagneius.
Galenus.
Gasparus Sanctius.
Genebrardus.
Gerson.
Gorranus.
Gregorius.
Greg. Nyssenus.
Greg. de Valentia.
Gretser.

H

Halensis.
Haymo
Heinsius.
Helvicus.
Hermogenes.
Hieronymus.
Hilarius.
Hippocrates.
Hippolytus.
Holcot.
Homerus.
Horatius.
Hugo Cardinalis.
Hugo Eterianus.

I

Jacobus de Valentia.
K. James.
Jansenius.
Ignatius.
Illyricus.
Irenæus.
Isidorus.
Isidorus Pelusiota.
Josephus.
Justinus.
Benedictus Justinianus.

K

Kemnitius.
Kimchi.

L

Laertius.
Cornelius à Lapide.
Laurentii historia Anatomica.
Joannes Leo.
Rabbi Levi.
Libavius.
Livius.
Lombardus.
Lorinus.
Ludolphus Carthusianus.
Ludovicus de Ponte vallis Oletani.
Ludovicus Vives.
Lutherus.
Lyranus.

M

Majoranus.
Maldonatus.
Marianus Scotus.
Marsilius Andreasius.
Martin Marreprelate.
Martinus Cantipretensis.
Justin Martyr.
Masius.
Matthew Paris.
Melchior Flavius.
Rabbi Menachem.
Mercer.
Minshew.
Mollerus.
Bishop Mountague.
Lord Michael de Montaigne.
Montanus.
Peter Morales.
Mr. Fines Morison.
Rabbi Moses.
Peter Moulin.
Muncer.
Musculus.

N

Hier. Natalis.
Nazianzenus.
Nicephorus.
Nicetas.
Nonnus.

O

Ockam.
Oecolampadius.
Oecumenius.
Jofrancus Offusius.
Olympiodorus.
Origenes.

P

Pacianus.
Pagninus.
Paracelsus.
Paulinus.
Pererius.
Peter Martyr.
Petrus Pomponatius.
Philo Judæus.
Photius.
Pighius.
Pineda.
Plato.
Plinius.
Plotinus.
Plutarchus.
Polybius.
Julianus Pomerius.
Porphyrius.
Postellus.
Primasius.
Procopius Gazæus.
Propertius.
Prosper.
Ptolomeus.

R

Dr. Raynolds.
Ribera.
Richeomus Jesuita.
Rodulphus Cluniacensis Monachus.
Rosinus.
Ruffinus.
Rupertus.

S

Emmanuel Sa.
Salianus.
Mr. Salkeld.
Salmanticensis Judæus.
Salmeron.
Rabbi Salomon.
Mr. Sands.
Sasbout.
Scaliger.
Scharpius.
Dr. Sclater.
Scotus.
Mr. Selden.
Seneca.
Septuaginta.
Mr. Sheldon.
Barthol. Sibylla.
Sixtus Senensis.
Sleidanus.
Socrates.
Sohnius.
Sophronius.
Soto.
Stapleton.
Robertus Stephanus.
Stow.
Strabo.
Suarez.
Suetonius.
Suidas.
Surius.
Symmachus.

T

Tacitus.
Tertullian.
Theodoretus.
Theodosius.
Theophylactus.
Petrus Thyræus.
Tichonius.
Titus Bostrensis.
Toletus.
Tostatus.
Solomo Trecensis.
Tremellius.
Trelcatius.
Historie of the councell of Trent.
Turrianus.

V

Valla.
Terentius Varro.
Vasques.
Vatablus.
Didacus Vega.
Ludovicus Vertomannus.
Blasius Viegas.
Joannes Viguerius.
Godfridus Abbas Vindocinensis.
Virgilius.
Vorstius.
Bishop Usher.
Leonardus de Utino.

W

Whitakerus.
Willet.

Z

Zanchius.
Zimenes.

O Blessed God, Father, Sonne, and holy Ghost, whose deserving mercie to me hath been so infinite, that nothing in earth, which I enjoy, is worthy enough to be offered unto thee: yet because thou hast so plentifully rewarded the widow of Sarepta, for sharing that little which she had, unto the Prophet; and hast promised even the kingdome of heaven to them, who in thy name give a cup of water, of cold water; and hast most graciously accepted the poorest oblations, both of the goats hair toward thy Tabernacle, and the widows two mites into the treasurie; receive (I most humbly beseech thee) the free-will-offering of my heart, and weak endeavours of my hand, in this intended service: and as thou didst fill Bezaleel and Aholiab with an excellent spirit of wisdome and subtill inventions, to finde out all curious works, to the beautifying of thy Tabernacle: so I most meekly desire thee, to enlighten my soul, to elevate my dull understanding; that I may search for such secret things as may be found, and finde such things as may be searched for lawfully and modestly; and that I may, like Joshuahs good spies, acquaint my self and others with the desert wayes, and the severall tracts and paths, which our souls, immediately after death, must travell and passe over, toward the Celestiall Canaan. O God, my good God, grant me to accomplish this, through the safe conduct of Him, who is the faithfull Guide, the onely Way, the Light, and Joy of my soul, my Lord and Saviour JESUS CHRIST. So be it, most gracious Redeemer, So be it.

MISCELLANIES OF DIVINITIE.

THE FIRST BOOK.

CHAP. I.

Sect. I. *THe ſubject of the whole Work. The reaſon why I choſe the Text of* Hebrews 9.27. *to diſcourſe upon. The diviſion of it.*

2 *Amphibologie prejudiciall to truth. Death appointed by* GOD, *yet for Adams fault. The tree of life kept from Adam, not by phantaſticall Hob-goblins, but by true Angels, and a flaming ſword brandiſhing it ſelf. Leviticall ceremonies dead, buried, deadly. Things redeemed diſpenſed with, yet ſtill appointed.*

3 *The Kingdome of Death reigning over all. Bodily death here meant; and onely once to be undergone.*

4 Μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο *implieth not neceſſarily the longinquitie of future times intercurrent; but rather a demonſtration that other things were precedent.* Τὸ [after] *doth often ſignifie an immediate ſucceſſion. Judgement here taken for an act of juſtice.*

5 *The generall Judgement here underſtood by Oecumenius & Bellarmine. The ſecond book of Eſdras apocryphal, and juſtly refuſed. More then the generall Judgement is meant. Even the particular judgement alſo is vouched by many authorities. Three queſtions ariſing from the former part of theſe words.*

SECT. I.

BEcauſe I intend (by GODS gracious aſſiſtance) to explain at large the nature both of humane ſouls and bodies (ſo farre as concerns a Divine) and to bring to light things hidden, ſecret, and ſtrange; and more eſpecially to unfold the eſtate and paſſages of mens ſouls in their origination, and likewiſe in their ſeparation from their bodies: alſo in their particular

judgement, and their conduct or conveyance to pleaſure or pain, with all the known occurrences which preſent themſelves *ab inſtanti terminativo vitæ*, from the laſt minute of life, till the ſaid ſouls ſhall diſcern the approach of CHRISTS ſecond coming. And becauſe I may (if GOD grant me life) in a ſecond Tractate write of the Reſurrection, and generall Judgement, and of the ſame humane ſouls, from the firſt inſtant of CHRISTS glorious appearing, till they are placed with their bodies in their eternall manſions; and of their bliſſe or puniſhments, with other particularities which concern that new World: In theſe regards I have choſen this Text, Heb. 9. 27.

Ἀπόκειται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἅπαξ ἀποθανεῖν, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις·

For theſe are words of great force and moment, ſerving aptlie to my purpoſe, as including and containing whatſoever may be expreſſed or conceived, concerning this ſubject, under theſe two Propoſitions,

1. *It is appointed unto Men once to die.*
2. *After this (is, or cometh) Judgement.*

Firſt, the particular Judgement immediately upon Death: Secondly, the generall Judgement, in that great day of Retribution; of which in due time hereafter, if it pleaſe GOD.

2. Now becauſe whatſoever is ambiguous and of divers ſignifications, is an enemie to the underſtanding, and that we are counſelled by Luther to avoid ἀμφιβολίαν in matter of Religion, as we would flee from a Devil; let me remove doubtfulneſſe from the words, and drawing away the overſhadowing veil or curtain of ambiguity, ſeek for the true ſenſe of each term queſtionable. And firſt of the firſt, Ἀπόκειται· *It is appointed.* Some things man appointeth, and GOD ſome others. This appointment is the ſanction, not of Man, but of GOD. Of things appointed by GOD, ſome are ſo *Lege naturæ inſtitutæ*, ſome *deſtitutæ:* ſome primitively, ſome occaſionally. This appointment came *lege naturæ deſtitutæ*, ſaith Gorranus: *à* DEO *ultore*, ſaith Boſquier in his *Terror Orbis*; the Elements having permiſſion to deſtroy themſelves, and the things compounded of them: GOD not onely driving Adam out of Paradiſe, but, by fire and ſword fortifying againſt his approach the way of the tree of life, *even whileſt Adam lived*, ſaith Epiphanius Hæreſ. 64: *yea till the Floud* (if Saint Chryſoſtome miſguide us not) *with ſtrange and uncouth aßiſtance of armed ſpirits:* which were not μορμολύκεια, terrible and horrible viſions; of affrighting fire in one place; of fire in the faſhion of a flaming ſword in an other place; of dreadfull ſhapes of beaſts otherwhere; as Theodoret, and after him and from him, Procopius Gazæus do fancie: but indeed there were true Angels, *or Cherubims; and a flaming ſword which turned every way*, Geneſ. 3. 24. More then one

Angel,

Angel, and more then two (I know not how many) and perhaps many ſwords; every Angel having at leaſt one ſword, a two-edged ſword (as ſome will have it) which they brandiſhed and flouriſhed with, to the terrour of our ſinfull parents. For what ſhould more Angels do with one ſword onely? Therefore the *flaming ſword* is to be underſtood for more ſwords, the ſingular for the plural, by a *Synecdoche*, the certain number for the uncertain; which is uſuall in Scripture: or els, beſides the aſtoniſhing ſight of Angels, prepared by an unknown manner and means to defend the ſtraits and paſſages unto EDEN, there was a ſword alſo which turned it ſelf every way; **The edge of a ſword brandiſhing, and turning itſelf,* as Tremellius and the Interlineary Bible do read, and that moſt agreeable to the Original. Again, of things appointed by GOD conſequentially: firſt, ſome have been wholly abrogated, as the Leviticall ceremonies; which now are *not onely* * *dead, but alſo deadly*, cauſing juſt damnation to the uſers of them: becauſe they deny in effect that Chriſt, who is the ſubſtance of thoſe types, is incarnate. It is true, that awhile after Chriſts reſurrection the Jewiſh rites continued; for the Synagogue was to be brought honourably to her grave; and at Jeruſalem eſpecially, S. James adviſed S. Paul to obſerve the Ceremonial Law: yea *there were fifteen Biſhops of Jeruſalem after Chriſts time; who all ſucceſſively were of the circumciſion, and one Mark was the firſt uncircumciſed Biſhop in the time of Adrian, after the deſtruction both of the Temple and Citie*, ſaith *Nicephorus. But in other places it was otherwiſe: for though S. Paul did circumciſe Timothie, *becauſe of the Jews which were in thoſe quarters*, (which he might well do, by reaſon the mother of Timothie was a Jeweſſe) yet Titus, **being a Greek, was not compelled to be circumciſed*, no though he was at Jeruſalem. Yea S. Paul telleth the Gentiles, with great majeſtie and ſolemnitie, **Behold, I Paul ſay unto you, that if ye be circumciſed, Chriſt ſhall profit you nothing*. Secondly, the things appointed by GOD have been redeemed, as the firſt-born, *Exod.* 34.20. and tithes, *Levit.* 27. 31. and theſe being inſtituted by GOD to one end, were by their redemption purchaſed to other uſes; yet made they no gain, but redeemed them at a dearer rate: ſee *Numb.* 18. 16. and *Levit.* 27. 31. Thirdly, ſome other things appointed by GOD have been diſpenſed withall. Thus circumciſion, while the Iſraelites travelled in the wildernes, and awhile after, was omitted above fourtie yeares, and again reſumed into practice, *Joſ.* 5. 2. Thus the Paſſeover, by one that was not clean, or was in his journey, might be forborn, *Numb.* 9. 13. To this third kinde and ſort of things by GOD appointed, do I reduce this in my text. This appointed death is not wholly abrogated, it is not redeemed; and yet ſometimes it hath been, ſometimes it ſhall be diſpenſed withall (of which hereafter) and yet for

* *Acies gladii ſeſe vibrantis & vertentis.*

* Non tantùm *mortuæ* ſed etiam *mortiferæ*. Vide Aquin. 1. 2. quæſt. 103. art. 4.

* Niceph. lib. 3. cap. 25.
* Acts 16. 3.

* Gal. 2. 3.

* Gal. 5. 2.

all this diſpenſation, it is truely ſaid, Ἀπόκειται. not *It* Was *appointed*, as having reference to what onely was paſt; but *It* Is *appointed.* It is a yoke, that neither our fathers did, nor we ſhall ever ſhake off: and not onely labour and travell is an**heavy yoke upon the ſonnes of Adam*, but much more death. Neither hath the worlds redeemer freed us from the ſtroke, but from the curſe of death; for even hitherto,

* *Pale death doth knock with equall power*
At th' poore mans doore and kingly tower.

The grave yet gapeth: and though myriads of myriads have died before: though Paracelſus promiſed immortality in this life, (and perhaps therefore was cut off in the prime of his yeares) yet death is**the houſe appointed for all living: and every man ſhall draw after him, as there are innumerable before him.* Of the longeſt liver hath been ſaid in the end, Βεβίωται, *His life is paſt*: or as the Romanes, when they were loth to ſay one was dead, ſpake ſignificantly to the ſenſe, yet mildly by this word *Vixit, He had his time, he did ſometimes live.* And it is the condition of all times, THOU SHALT DIE THE DEATH.

3 Ἀπόκειται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. The univerſall note or particle is not added. It is not ſaid, πᾶσι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. yet ſure it is included, and ſo meant; Not Chriſt himſelf, the deſtroyer of death, is exempted; nor his thrice-bleſſed Mother, nor fair Abſalom, nor ſtrong Sampſon, nor wiſe Solomon, nor craftie Achitophel. It is appointed to all, men and women; no ſex is freed, no nation priviledged, no age excepted. If ſome few have been diſpenſed withall, I will ſay with S. Auguſtine,**Other are the bounds of humane things, other the ſignes of divine power: ſome things are done naturally, and ſome miraculouſly.* We ſpeak of the ordinarie courſe. *It is appointed for all men* TO DIE, Ἀποθανεῖν. Death is a name of ſundry ſignifications, and it is taken diverſly: for there is

The laſt death, by the loſſe of glory:
The death of the ſoul, by the loſſe of grace:
The death of the body, by the loſſe of the ſoul.

***If it be demanded*, ſaith S. Auguſtine, *what death God meaneth to our firſt parents, Whether the death of the body, or of the ſoul, or of the whole man, or that which is called* THE SECOND DEATH; *we muſt*, ſaith he, *anſwer, He threatneth all.* The death of the ſoul began immediately upon their eating, and is evidenced by their hiding themſelves, and ſhame to be ſeen. The death of the body preſently ſeconded it, *it ſuddenly becomes mortall*, ſaith Theodoret. The ſentence of mortality GOD called *death*, in Symmachus his expoſition: *For after the divine ſentence, every day (that I may ſo ſpeak) he looked for death*, as it is in the ſame Theodoret. As we now expect the reſurrection and life eternall every moment: ſo Adam every minute looked for death; I am ſure he deſerved it. Peter Martyr on 1. *Cor.* 13. 12. *Our firſt parents periſhed*

*Eccluſ 40. 1.

Pallida morsæquo pulſat pede pauperum tabernas, Regúmque turres. Horat. Carm. l. 1. Od. 4.

*Job. 30. 23. and 21. 33.

Eccluſ 14. 17.

**Alii ſunt humanarum limites rerum, alia divinarum ſigna virtutum: alia naturaliter, alia mirabiliter fiunt.* Aug lib. de *Cura pro mortuis* gerenda cap. 16

*Aug. De Civit. Dei lib. 13. cap. 12.

Conſule, ſi placet, ingenioſum ejus Tractatum, cap. 15. ejuſdem libri.

Theod. in Gen. quæſt. 38.

ed ſo ſoon as they tranſgreſſed: becauſe no other death is to be imagined but a departure from life, and we have no life out of God. Therefore they died, becauſe they departed from God: and their ſoul was not ſnatcht away from their bodie, but in a manner buried in it. For the preſent, our life is not a life, but a death. Of the bodily death onely are the words of my Text to be underſtood, being a prime commentarie on *Geneſ.* 3.19. *Duſt thou art, and unto duſt ſhalt thou return.* It is appointed for men ἅπαξ ἀποθανεῖν, *Once to die.* **What fall is in the devil, that death is in man.* They fell but once, we die but once. *We muſt needs die, and are as water ſpilt on the ground, which cannot be gathered up again.* 2. Sam. 14. 14. Waters once ſpilt embrace the duſt, and are not gathered up again, nor can be ſpilt again. *Chriſt taſted death for every man,* Hebr. 2. 9. As Chriſt being once dead, *dieth no more, death hath no more dominion over him,* Rom. 6. 9. ſo is it regularly and ordinarily with all other, one corporall death ſufficeth. *It is appointed unto men* ONCE *to die.*

4 Μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις, *But after this the judgement.* Let me ſpeak of the words ſeverally, and then in a lump or maſſe together. That theſe articles, *Poſt, tum, mox, modò; After, then, anon, preſently,* and the like, are taken at large for ſome yeares before or after: you may ſee it proved in* Albericus Gentilis. The Scripture thus, Geneſ. 38.1. *At that time* (*But it was ten yeares,* ſaith Tremellius) Exod. 2. 11. *It came to paſſe in thoſe dayes:* and he meaneth fourty yeares. Matt. 3. 1. *In thoſe dayes:* that is, twenty and five yeares after. Luke. 23.43. *To day* is taken for *preſently.* Aretius hath it, κατὰ τοῦτο, *Upon that,* or *preſently after that.* And queſtionles that is the meaning: for though τὸ *After* may be interpreted *long-after,* as the word *proximus,* contrarilie, doth not enforce neceſſarily a nearenes: *Proximus huic, longo ſed proximus intervallo,* ſaid Virgil excellently; *He was next, but a great diſtance between:* yet in the holy Scripture, Μετὰ τοῦτο, *after that,* doth moſt times rather intimate the procedure and order of things done, then intend a large intercedencie of time. John 19. 28. Μετὰ τοῦτο *After that, Jeſus ſaith I thirſt:* you muſt not underſtand it, *long after,* not yeares, moneths, weeks, dayes, or houres after that; for our Saviour hung upon the croſſe not above foure houres, and many things were ſaid and done before this. So in this place, μετὰ τοῦτο doth not evidently inferre a ſpacious diſtance of time, but by the words *after that,* we may ſay is meant, not *long after,* but *preſently,* or *thereupon, judgement cometh after death.* Which I the more confidently do ſo interpret, becauſe I know no place in the divine Writ, where Μετὰ τοῦτο doth ſignifie a vaſt and immenſe longitude of time: but there are alſo, beſides them, other evident words, arguing ſuch pawſes and ſpaces of times: As alſo, becauſe the word μετὰ or *poſt* itſelf is ſo expounded by Pererius on John 5. 4.* *After the troubling*

**Primi parentes quum tranſgreſſi ſunt, illico periêre: quoniam mors nequaquam alia cenſenda, quàm receſſus à vita: nec vitam habemus citra Deum. Quare mortui ſunt, quia à Deo receſſerunt; & eorum anima non fuit à corpore avulſa, ſed in eo quodammodo ſepulta: in præſentia, non vitam, ſed mortem vivimus.*

**Quod caſus in diabolo, id in homine mors.*

**Alb. Gent. diſput. ad 1. lib. Maccab. cap. 3.*

all this diſpenſation, it is truely ſaid, Ἀπόκειται. not *It* Was *appointed*, as having reference to what onely was paſt; but *It* Is *appointed*. It is a yoke, that neither our fathers did, nor we ſhall ever ſhake off: and not onely labour and travell is an***heavy yoke upon the ſonnes of Adam*, but much more death. Neither hath the worlds redeemer freed us from the ſtroke, but from the curſe of death; for even hitherto,

* *Pale death doth knock with equall power*
At th' poore mans doore and kingly tower.

The grave yet gapeth: and though myriads of myriads have died before: though Paracelſus promiſed immortality in this life, (and perhaps therefore was cut off in the prime of his yeares) yet death is**the houſe appointed for all living: and every man ſhall draw after him, as there are innumerable before him.* Of the longeſt liver hath been ſaid in the end, Βεβίωται, *His life is paſt*: or as the Romanes, when they were loth to ſay one was dead, ſpake ſignificantly to the ſenſe, yet mildly by this word *Vixit*, *He had his time, he did ſometimes live.* And it is the condition of all times, THOU SHALT DIE THE DEATH.

3 Ἀπόκειται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. The univerſall note or particle is not added. It is not ſaid, πᾶσι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. yet ſure it is included, and ſo meant; Not Chriſt himſelf, the deſtroyer of death, is exempted; nor his thrice-bleſſed Mother, nor fair Abſalom, nor ſtrong Sampſon, nor wiſe Solomon, nor craftie Achitophel. It is appointed to all, men and women; no ſex is freed, no nation priviledged, no age excepted. If ſome few have been diſpenſed withall, I will ſay with S. Auguſtine,**Other are the bounds of humane things, other the ſignes of divine power: ſome things are done naturally, and ſome miraculouſly.* We ſpeak of the ordinarie courſe. *It is appointed for all men* TO DIE, Ἀποθανεῖν. Death is a name of ſundry ſignifications, and it is taken diverſly: for there is

The laſt death, by the loſſe of glory:
The death of the ſoul, by the loſſe of grace:
The death of the body, by the loſſe of the ſoul.

**If it be demanded*, ſaith S. Auguſtine, *what death God meaneth to our firſt parents, Whether the death of the body, or of the ſoul, or of the whole man, or that which is called* THE SECOND DEATH; *we muſt*, ſaith he, *anſwer, He threatneth all.* The death of the ſoul began immediately upon their eating, and is evidenced by their hiding themſelves, and ſhame to be ſeen. The death of the body preſently ſeconded it, *it ſuddenly becomes mortall*, ſaith Theodoret. The ſentence of mortality GOD called *death*, in Symmachus his expoſition: *For after the divine ſentence, every day (that I may ſo ſpeak) he looked for death*, as it is in the ſame Theodoret. As we now expect the reſurrection and life eternall every moment: ſo Adam every minute looked for death; I am ſure he deſerved it. Peter Martyr on 1. *Cor.* 13. 12. *Our firſt parents periſhed*

*Eccluſ 40. 1.

**Pallida morsæquo pulſat pede pauperum tabernas, Regúmque turres.* Horat. Carm. l. 1. Od. 4.

*Job. 30. 23. and 21. 33.

Eccluſ 14. 17.

**Alii ſunt humanarum limites rerum, alia divinarum ſigna virtutum: alia naturaliter, alia mirabiliter fiunt.* Aug. lib. de *Cura pro mortuis gerenda* cap. 16

*Aug. De Civit. Dei lib. 13. cap. 12.

Conſule, ſi placet, ingenioſum ejus Tractatum, cap. 15. ejuſdem libri.

Theod. in Gen. quæſt. 38.

ed ſo ſoon as they tranſgreſſed: becauſe no other death is to be imagined but a departure from life, and we have no life out of God. Therefore they died, becauſe they departed from God: and their ſoul was not ſnatcht away from their bodie, but in a manner buried in it. For the preſent, our life is not a life, but a death. Of the bodily death onely are the words of my Text to be underſtood, being a prime commentarie on *Geneſ.* 3.19. *Duſt thou art, and unto duſt ſhalt thou return.* It is appointed for men ἅπαξ ἀποθανεῖν, *Once to die.* **What fall is in the devil, that death is in man.* They fell but once, we die but once. *We muſt needs die, and are as water ſpilt on the ground, which cannot be gathered up again.* 2. Sam. 14. 14. Waters once ſpilt embrace the duſt, and are not gathered up again, nor can be ſpilt again. *Chriſt taſted death for every man,* Hebr. 2. 9. As Chriſt being once dead, *dieth no more, death hath no more dominion over him,* Rom. 6. 9. ſo is it regularly and ordinarily with all other, one corporall death ſufficeth. *It is appointed unto men* ONCE *to die.*

4 Μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις, *But after this the judgement.* Let me ſpeak of the words ſeverally, and then in a lump or maſſe together. That theſe articles, *Poſt, tum, mox, modò; After, then, anon, preſently,* and the like, are taken at large for ſome yeares before or after: you may ſee it proved in* Albericus Gentilis. The Scripture thus, Geneſ. 38.1. *At that time* (*But it was ten yeares,* ſaith Tremellius) Exod. 2. 11. *It came to paſſe in thoſe dayes:* and he meaneth fourty yeares. Matt. 3. 1. *In thoſe dayes:* that is, twenty and five yeares after. Luke. 23.43. *To day* is taken for *preſently.* Aretius hath it, κατὰ τοῦτο, *Upon that,* or *preſently after that.* And queſtionles that is the meaning: for though τὸ *After* may be interpreted *long-after,* as the word *proximus,* contrarilie, doth not enforce neceſſarily a nearenes: *Proximus huic, longo ſed proximus intervallo,* ſaid Virgil excellently; *He was next, but a great diſtance between:* yet in the holy Scripture, Μετὰ τοῦτο, *after that,* doth moſt times rather intimate the procedure and order of things done, then intend a large intercedencie of time. John 19. 28. Μετὰ τοῦτο *After that, Jeſus ſaith I thirſt:* you muſt not underſtand it, *long after,* not yeares, moneths, weeks, dayes, or houres after that; for our Saviour hung upon the croſſe not above foure houres, and many things were ſaid and done before this. So in this place, μετὰ τοῦτο doth not evidently inferre a ſpacious diſtance of time, but by the words *after that,* we may ſay is meant, not *long after,* but *preſently,* or *thereupon, judgement cometh after death.* Which I the more confidently do ſo interpret, becauſe I know no place in the divine Writ, where Μετὰ τοῦτο doth ſignifie a vaſt and immenſe longitude of time: but there are alſo, beſides them, other evident words, arguing ſuch pawſes and ſpaces of times: As alſo, becauſe the word μετὰ or *poſt* itſelf is ſo expounded by Pererius on John 5. 4.* *After the troubling*

Primi parentes quum tranſgreſſi ſunt, illico periêre: quoniam mors nequaquam alia cenſenda, quàm receſſus à vita: nec vitam habemus citra Deum. Quare mortui ſunt, quia à Deo receſſerunt; & eorum anima non fuit à corpore avulſa, ſed in eo quodammodo ſepulta: in præſentia, non vitam, ſed mortem vivimus. **Quod caſus in diabolo, id in homine mors.*

*Alb. Gent. diſput. ad 1. lib. Maccab. cap. 3.

* *Poſt motionem aquæ, ſignificat idem ac ſi dictum fuiſſet, Poſtquam cœpta erat motio, & turbatio aquæ.*

bling of the water, ſignifieth as much as if it had been ſaid, After the moving and troubling of the water was begun, ſaith he: for the infirm did wait and expect the moving of the water, ver. 3. and the impotent man ſaid to Chriſt, ver. 7. *I have no man to put me into the pool, when the water is troubled*; that is, ſo ſoon as the water beginneth to be troubled: for the πρῶτος ἐμβὰς, *the firſt deſcendant* into the water, μετὰ τὴν ταραχὴν, *after the troubling*, was healed. Therefore you muſt expound the word *after*, for *immediately after*, inſtantly there upon. For if he had firſt ſtepped in, he had been healed: whereas if you expound, *after the motion*, that is, *a long while after*, he might indeed have been put into the water, but never the nearer to be healed. So alſo Μετὰ ταῦτα, John 5. 19. and divers other places evince, that the phraſe implieth not length of time intervenient, but rather an hiſtoricall narration of things ſucceeding, and ſometimes depending one of the other. So here, firſt death, *after that*, (i) ſhortly after that, cometh κρίσις, *judicium*, judgement. Judgement is taken two wayes; firſt, for the aſſenting or diſſenting of the intellect; in this ſenſe we ſay, *I like or like not ſuch a mans judgement*: ſo judgement is taken for ones opinion, perſwaſion, or determination. The Text is not meant of judgement in this ſenſe. Secondly, it is uſed for an act of juſtice, giving to every man what belongeth to him. Thus is it here taken. An act of juſtice not proceeding from man, but from God, and terminated upon man. The judgements of God upon man are manifold, both in this preſent life, and in the life to come. The judgement here mentioned, is the judgement after death. And of judgements after death there are two, { Private of ſouls, / Publick of bodies and ſouls.

Whether of theſe two judgements is to be underſtood, we hope to finde out, when we have conſidered the laſt thing propounded, the words in a lump together, Μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις, *After that the judgement.*

5 That there are two judgements after this life, we take it here for granted; but by Gods aſſiſtance it ſhall be, in a fitter place of this diſcourſe, demonſtrated at large. But whether the generall judgement of ſouls and bodies be eſpecially here meant, or the private and particular judgement of ſouls, or both of them, is the queſtion now, and muſt be determined by authority and reaſon.

Oecumenius is for the firſt way, and wittily interprets theſe words; as if it had been ſaid, *When all and every one which ever were in the world, are dead; then followeth, after the univerſall death, univerſall judgement.* To him aſſenteth * Bellarmine, and the book of Eſdras long before either of them, * *After death ſhall the judgement come, when we ſhall live again, &c.* where the generall judgement is pointed at, and not the particular. And

*Bell. de Purgat lib. 2. cap. 4.
*2. Eſdr. 14. 35.

from

from hence S. Paul may be thought to have borrowed the words. I anſwer, that the Apoſtle had them not from that author; for *there is neither Greek, nor Hebrew copie of that book of Eſdras*, * ſaith Bellarmine, from S. Hierome: onely it is preſerved in Latine, and *no Councel ever held it as canonicall*, ſaith Bellarmine. Again, I can finde no paſſage of either of theſe books of Eſdras cited in the New Teſtament; though out of other apocryphall books there be divers things taken. And though Ambroſe cited the ſecond book of Eſdras (commonly called *the fourth book of Eſdras*) in his book *de Bono mortis*, and in his ſecond book on Luke, and in his ſecond epiſtle to Horatianus; yea, though * Sixtus Senenſis ſaith of Ambroſe, that Ambroſe thought Eſdras wrote this book by divine revelation, and that S. Paul did follow Eſdras in thoſe things which he hath concerning the diverſitie of order of glory, of brightnes in the elect when they ſhall be raiſed: yet Sixtus Senenſis himſelf eſteemeth not the book to be either canonicall, or deutero-canonicall, but meerely apocryphall: and *in it*, he ſaith, *are * ſome ſuſpected doctrines manifeſtly gainſaying the rules of orthodox faith*: and he inſtanceth in the * fourth chapter, maintaining, * *that all ſouls are kept in certain hidden floores or chambers in hell, till the generall judgement*. Sixtus Senenſis addeth, that S. Ambroſe ſeemeth to approve of this opinion. *Alſo*, ſaith he, in chap. 6. verſ. 49. *there are fabulous Jewiſh fooleries, of Henoch and Leviathan, two fiſhes*. Upon theſe grounds I may confidently ſay, that though ſome ignorant people might be ſeduced by this book, (and thence, perhaps, aroſe the error of the ſouls not being judged till the reſurrection) yet S. Paul would never take a teſtimony from that book, which hath ſuch palpable untruths, and is not extant in Greek or Hebrew. Moreover it hath no place vouchſafed in Arias Montanus his Interlineary Bible: nor doth Emanuel Sa comment on any word of it: and Bellarmine himſelf marvelleth why Genebrard would have it held canonicall. Eſtius ſaith, * *That book hath no authoritie in the Church*. But I return to the firſt expoſition.

The generall judgement may be meant, and is involved; I will not deny it. Yet theſe reaſons perſwade me, that the particular judgement is not excluded. Firſt, if the Apoſtle had intended it onely of the generall judgement, it is likely he would, as he doth in other places, have uſed fitteſt expreſſions, and terms properly advancing to that ſenſe: as thus, *At the ſecond coming of Chriſt*, or, *At the end of the world*, or, *When the corruptible hath put on incorruption*, or, *After the reſurrection cometh judgement*. But, ſince it is written, *It is appointed for men to die, and after that cometh judgement*; to interpret it onely of the generall judgement, is, in my opinion, to leave a μέγα χάσμα, *a great gulf* between death and judgement: which *hiatus* will handſomely

* Bell. de Verbo Dei, lib. 1. cap. 20.

* Sixt. Sen Bib. Sanct. lib. 1.

* *Quædam ſuſpecta dogmata, regulis orthodoxæ fidei aperte contradicentia.*

* 2. Eſdr. 4. 35, 36, 39, 41, 42.

* *Omnes animas detineri quibuſdam abditis promptuariis in inferno.*

* *Liber ille non habet autoritatem in Eccleſia* Eſt. in 2. Sent. Diſt. 19. num. 4.

ſomely be filled up, if there be reference to the particular judgement.

Secondly, what if I ſay, that the words do denote rather the not paſſing of judgement while we live, and the beginning of it to be ſhortly after death, excluding judgement in this life, and placing death rather before judgement, then any great diſtance betwixt death and judgement? according to the native uſe of the words μετὰ τοῦτο, of which before.

The ſecond expoſition is of Gregory de Valentia, * who applieth the words to the particular judgement immediately upon death. So doth Ludovicus de ponte Vallis Oletani, * who ſets it down as a veritie of faith, **Concerning the particular, judgement of the ſoul, which is done immediately after death; every one is judged inviſibly preſently after his death:* and evinceth it by this Text. So doth Joannes * Viguerius. * Buſæus the Jeſuite likewiſe accounteth **the ſecond laſt thing, to be the particular judgement following death immediately; the ſeveritie whereof*, ſaith he, *Job the holy patient feared.* Job 31. 14. *What ſhall I do when God riſeth up? and when he viſiteth, what ſhall I anſwer him?* S. Ambroſe on this place hath it thus, * *Every one ſhall be judged after death according to their own deſervings. Which words do point at the particular judgement*, ſaith Suarez. Laſtly, leſt I may ſeem too eager againſt the ſecond book of Eſdras, let me borrow a teſtimony or two from thence. 2 Eſdr. 9. 11, 12. *They that lothed my law, while they had yet libertie and place of repentance open unto them, muſt know it after death by pain.* And 2. Eſdr. 7. 56. *While we lived and committed ſinne, we conſidered not that we ſhould* BEGIN *to ſuffer for it* AFTER DEATH. Whence we may probably collect, That the beginning of puniſhment is immediately after death, upon the particular judgement; and the increaſe or additament at the generall judgement. 2 That ſome are in torments before the generall day of retribution. 3 That the beginning to ſuffer, is not after a long time, (GOD onely knoweth how long) but after death, yea preſently after it. All theſe proofs on each ſide make way for the third and beſt interpretation, That the Apoſtle meaneth not onely either of theſe judgements, but both of them. Benedictus Juſtinian on theſe words, thus, * *After every ones death private judgement follows, in which every one is to give an account of his actions: after the end of the world ſhall be the judgement of all, both men and devils. Of both the Apoſtle may be underſtood*, ſaith he. So alſo Salmeron, and Hugo Cardinalis, and Carthuſianus. Oecolampadius thus, * *Whether you underſtand the ſpeciall judgement, or the generall, it matters not.*

Thus have I brought you back to the point where I firſt began: That this text is fitted to my intentions, affording me juſt liberty to write whatſoever may be conceived or expreſſed, con-

* Tom. 4. Diſp. 1. quæſt. 22. punct. 9.

* Part. 1. Meditat. medit. 9.

* *De particulari judicio animæ, quod ſit proximè poſt mortem, judicium ſingulorum exerceri inviſibiliter ſtatim poſt cujuſque mortem.*

* Viguer. Inſtit. pag. 692.

* Buſ. initio Panarii Antidotorum ſpirituall.

* *Secundum noviſſimum eſt judicium particulare mortem proximè conſequens.*

* *Poſt mortem judicabitur unuſquiſque juxta merita ſua.*

* *Poſt cujuſque obitum, ſequitur judicium privatum, in quo quiſque ſuarum actionum reddit rus cſtrationem: poſt finem mundi erit judicium omnium, tum hominum tum dæmonum.*

* *Sive ſpeciale judicium intelligas, ſive generale, nihil refert.*

concerning the eſtate of humane ſouls in their animation or in death, or after it in the life future; becauſe the words muſt be expounded of both judgements. And now the text being cleared from ambiguities, the termes explained, the ſtate being made firm and ſure, not rolling and changeable; and being fixed upon its baſis and foundation, three queſtions do ſeem to ariſe from the firſt words of the text, and each of them to crave its anſwer, before I come to my main intendment.

Firſt, How and when Death came to be appointed for us?

Secondly, Whether Adam and his children, all and every one without priviledge or exception, muſt and ſhall die? *It is appointed for men to die.*

Thirdly, Whether they that were raiſed up from the dead at any time, did die the ſecond time? *It is appointed to men once to die.*

O Gracious LORD, who ordereſt all things ſweetly, and who doſt diſpoſe whatſoever man doth purpoſe; I humbly implore thy powerfull guidance, and enlightning aſſiſtance, in all this work, for his ſake, who is Alpha and Omega, the Way, the Truth, and the Life, thy onely SONNE, my bleſſed SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST: Amen.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

1 *How GOD is immortall; how angels and the ſouls of men; how Adams body was mortall, and yet immortall, though compounded of contraries.*

2 *Ariſtotles laſt words; his death; Holcot or the Philoſophers pray for him. Ariſtotle canonized by his followers. Plato and Ariſtotle compared. Vives taxed. Adams body was not framed of the earth, or duſt of Paradiſe.*

3. *Adam ſhould not have been ſubject to any externall force; he was Lord of the creatures: inward diſtemper he could not have. Adams bodily temperature: Chriſts, who was fairer then the children of Adam: the helps for Adams body, meat, drink, and ſleep*

4. *Divers opinions of the tree of life. If Adam had eaten of the tree of life before or after his fall, he had lived for ever. If he had not ſinned he had not died, though he had not taſted of the tree of life. To what uſe the tree of life ſhould have ſerved.*

5. *The Councel of Millan: Cardinall Cajetan, Richeomus the Jeſuite, Julianus Pomerius and S. Auguſtine think that Adam could not have died, if he had not ſinned. The book of Wiſedome, Holcot, Doctor Eſtius, and two paſſages of Scripture Canonical, are authorities evincing that Adam had in the ſtate of innocency an immortall body.*

1. TO the full anſwering of the firſt queſtion, how or why Death was appointed for us, I ſhall need to cleare but theſe two points;

That Adam for ſinne was appointed to die.
That Adams ſinne, and puniſhment was propagated to us.

Thus ſinne was the mother of death, thus we were appointed to die, becauſe of ſinne. As a preparative to the firſt of theſe two points, I hold it fit to demonſtrate, that Adam at firſt was made an immortall creature.

Concerning Adams ſoul, and the ſpirits of all men deſcended from him, that they are immortall, I hope to prove it ſo ſoundly in an other part of this tractate, that I will fear no other reproof but this, that I bring too much proof for it. Therefore ſuppoſing, or rather borrowing that truth (which by

GODS grace ſhall be repayed with intereſt) I now come to ſhew that Adams bodie was created immortall.

Immortall I ſay, not as GOD is immortall, who neither had beginning, nor ſhall have end; with whom is no ſhadow of change, much leſſe any reall, ſubſtantiall change; who hath, as all other good things elſe, ſo, immortalitie eminently; and ſo eminently, that our Apoſtle in ſome ſort excludeth all others, and appropriateth it to him, ſaying, 1. Tim. 6. 16. GOD *onely hath immortalitie.*

Neither was the body of Adam immortall, as the Angelicall ſpirits, and ſouls of men, which had a beginning, but ſhall have no end: Nor immortall, as the counſels of GOD, which had no beginning, but ſhall have an end.

His bodie was not eternal, but eviternal, or immortall; not abſolutely immortall, but conditionally: it ſhould never have taſted death, if he had not firſt taſted of the forbidden fruit. Immortall, not as if it could not die, but becauſe it might and could have lived ever. He had not *non poſſe mori*, and ſo he was mortall; he had *poſſe non mori*, and ſo was immortall. As *mortall* is taken for *earthly*, *animall*, and contra-diſtinct to *ſpirituall*, ſo his bodie was mortall and terrene, not ſpirituall or celeſtiall: As he could not poſſibly die, unleſſe he had ſinned, his very bodie was immortall.

In the Schoole-phraſe, thus: both *mortall* and *immortall* are taken two waies,

Mortall, for one
- who muſt needs die: thus Adam was not mortall in innocency, but by ſinne was made mortall.
- who can die: thus was he mortall, yet onely *in ſenſu diviſo*; becauſe he could ſinne, therefore could die.

Immortall, for one
- who cannot die: ſo Adam in innocency was not immortall, ſave onely *in ſenſu conjuncto:* he was immortall and could not die, unleſſe he ſinned.
- upon whom there is no neceſſity laid that he ſhould die: thus was he ſimply immortall.

Lumbard thus, *Adam had in his nature ſome mortalitie, to wit an aptnes to die; ſo he had in his nature ſome immortality, that is, an aptnes by which he might not die.* 2. Sent. diſt. 19. lit. F.

Further, as ſome have ſaid, Adam was neither mortall, nor immortall (for thus wrote Petrus Diaconus, and Fulgentius, and Maxentius) ſo others have written, that Adam was made both mortall and immortall: and all and every one of theſe in ſome ſenſe is moſt true. Auguſtine ſaith that *Adams body before ſinne may be ſaid to be mortall in one reſpect, and immortall in another*, as he there proveth at large. Hierome hath a different ſtrain, and an unuſuall phraſe in one of his * epiſtles: wherein he

* *Adam in natura ſua habuit mortalitatem quandam, ſcilicet aptitudinem moriendi: ità aliquam immortalitatem in natura ſua habuit, id eſt, aptitudinem quâ poterat non mori.* *Pet. Diac. de Gratia Chriſt. lib. 1. cap. 6. Fulg. lib. 2. cap. 13. Max. Profeſſ. Fidei ſuæ, cap. 8.

* *Corpus Adæ ante peccatum, & mortale ſecundum aliam; & immortale ſecundum aliam cauſam dici poterat.* De Geneſi ad literam lib. 6. cap. 25.

* Epiſt. ad Paulum Concordienſem.

he maketh the body to be eternall, till the ſerpent, by his ſinne, prevailed againſt Adam; and aſcribeth a ſecond kinde of immortality to the body, becauſe ſome of the firſt ages lived ſo long a time, as about, or above 900 yeares.

Even they who ſay Adams body was mortall, agree in ſenſe with me. They diſtinguiſh thus, *It is one thing to be mortall, and another thing to be ſubject to death.* If they grant to us, that he was not obnoxious to death, and could not die without ſinne, I will not be offended much, though they ſay he was mortall. *As this our fleſh, which now we have, is not therefore not to be wounded, becauſe there is no neceſsitie that it ſhould be wounded: ſo the fleſh of Adam in paradiſe was not therefore not mortall, becauſe there was no neceſsitie that it ſhould die*, ſaith Auguſtine. So that this is but a meer logomachy. They who call him *mortall* expound themſelves, that he could not *mori*, unleſſe he had ſinned; and I mean no more, when I ſay he was *immortall*; that is, he could not have died in the ſtate of innocencie: without a precedent tranſgreſſion he could not have been ſubject or obnoxius to death. They ſay, though he ſhould not have died, yet he was mortall: I ſay, he was therefore onely immortall, becauſe in that bleſſed eſtate he could not die. Whether of theſe two contraries, *Mortall* or *Immortall*, do beſt fit Adam before he ſinned, let the reader judge.

De peccat. Meritis & Remiſſ. l. 1. c. 3.

As bodies are compounded of contrarieties, they are ſubject to diſſolution; to the evidencing whereof, let me recount what Holcot ſaith on Wiſedome 12. 22. upon theſe words, *We ſhould look for mercy.*

2 *Ariſtotle*, ſaith Holcot, *ſpake theſe his laſt words*, I REIOYCE THAT I GO OUT OF THE WORLD, WHICH IS COMPOUNDED OF CONTRARIES; BECAUSE EACH OF THE FOURE ELEMENTS IS CONTRARY TO OTHER, AND THEREFORE HOW CAN THIS BODY COMPOUNDED OF THEM, LONG ENDURE? *Then he dyed, and the Philoſophers prayed for him*, ſaith Holcot. And becauſe he did ſcorn to be behinde the Philoſophers in love to Ariſtotle, Holcot himſelf ſecondeth their prayers, thus, * *He that receiveth the ſouls of Philoſophers, let him receive thy ſoul.* This he ſpeaketh to Ariſtotle, by a part of that little Rhetorick that Holcot had, or was uſed in his dayes: or otherwiſe it might be the prayer of the Philoſophers related by Holcot; for the words are doubtfull. No marvell therefore if after this, our Chriſtian Peripateticks, the Divines of Culleyn, have made Ariſtotle a Saint, as they did, if we beleeve * Cornelius Agrippa, and perhaps prayed to him as devoutly as others prayed for him. * *They count him among the Gods*, ſaith Agrippa in his 45 Chapter, though Agrippa himſelf be of a contrarie opinion; for he ſaith, * *Ariſtotle killed himſelf, being made a ſacrifice worthy of the Devils.* Sure I am, I have

* *Ille qui ſuſcipit animas philoſophorum, ſuſcipiat animam tuam.*

* Corn. Agr. De Vanit. Scient.
* *Divis annumerant.*
* *Ipſis Dæmonibus dignum factus ſacrificium*

I have read in a book *Of the life and death of Ariſtotle*, in the beginning whereof the Poët prayeth to GOD from heaven to help him to write, concerning Ariſtotle, acceptable things: and to ſpeak in his words,

De ſapiente viro, cujus cor lumine miro
Luſtrâſti Divæ ſuper omnes Philoſophiæ;
Quem ſi non fractum, lethi per flebilis actum,
Adventus prolis Divæ, veri quoque Solis
Poſt ſe liquiſſet, fidei qui vi micuiſſet,
Creditur à multis doctoribus, artis adultis,
Quòd fidei lumen, illuſtrans mentis acumen,
Defenſatorem vix ſciviſſet meliorem.

From whence the commenting queſtioniſt examineth, Whether Ariſtotle would have been in an high degree the great champion of the Chriſtian faith, if he had lived after Chriſts time. And he reſolveth affirmatively: becauſe Ariſtotle had the beſt intellect among all the creatures under the ſunne: for *ſupernaturals* (ſaith he) *are given according to the diſpoſition of naturals,* * *with mens endeavour; grace diſtilling on man, according as he well uſeth the talent of nature.* But at the end of that book, the Expoſitor ſtrikes all dead in theſe words, * *Concluding finally, and with truth, I ſay, that Ariſtotle (who heartily implored the mercy of* GOD, *praying,* O BEING OF BEINGS HAVE MERCY ON ME,) *by an holy and bodily death is tranſlated** *to the Chair of Eſtate, the Seat-royall, and Throne of everlaſting bliſſe.* Yea, he holds the man mad who doubts hereof; becauſe Ariſtotle had the knowledge of the Almighty, becauſe he loved GOD as the fountain of all goodneſſe, becauſe Ariſtotle was as neceſſary before the incarnation of Chriſt, as the giving of grace neceſſarily preſuppoſeth nature. Whereupon he preſumeth that Ariſtotle was * *the forerunner of Chriſt in naturals, as John the Baptiſt in ſupernaturals; and that he was one of them in the Old Law, who by a perſonall grace were of the New Law.* Juſt as the Fathers ſay, *David was a man in the Old, not of the old Teſtament.*

If Ariſtotle had grace, if he be the fore-runner of Chriſt, if he be placed in eternall happineſſe, it is a queſtion not unworthy theſe curious times, Whether they ſinned moſt who prayed unto him; or Holcot, or the Philoſophers cited by Holcot, who prayed for him.

And without juſt offence to Ariſtotles Lycæum, I hope I may ſay, though Jofrancus Offuſius, that great Mathematician, in his preface to Maximilian, which is before his book *Of the divine power of ſtarres*, ſaith, that Ariſtotle was *the High-prieſt of Philoſophers*, yea * *an heavenly man*, ſaith Heinſius: others have deified him. Yet, there were divers Philoſophers, from

* *Cum conatu hominum.*

Concludendo finaliter & cum veritate, dico, &c.

* ENS ENTIUM MISERERE MEI.
* *Ad ſolium æternæ beatitudinis.*

* *Præcurſor Chriſti, in naturalibus, ſicut Joannes Baptiſta fuit præcurſor, ad præparandam ipſi plebem perfectam, in gratuitis; & fuit unus ex iis in Lege Veteri, qui per gratiam perſonalem fuerunt de Lege Nova.*

* *Vir cæleſtis.* Henſ. Prolegom. in Nonnum.

Ariſtotles death till ſome hundreds of yeares after Chriſts time, who were in greater eſtimate among all the learned of thoſe times, then ever Ariſtotle was; and perhaps there may be a farre perfecter body of Philoſophie compiled from the diſperſed tenents of other ancienter Philoſophers, and more accordant to truth and Scriptures, then ever could be gathered from Peripateticall principles.

Theodoret in his fift book *De curandis Græcorum affectibus* (as ſome have it) or *De Græcarum affectionum curatione*, lib. 4. which ſome do intitle *De Naturâ*, hath theſe words; * *Ariſtotle hath impudently affirmed that the ſoul was corruptible, as much as Democritus and Epicurus.* Again, *Who be now the Preſidents of the Stoicall ſect, and who are the defenders of the doctrine of Ariſtotle the Stagiritan? &c. And as for Plato, who made many ſpeeches of the immortalitie of the ſoul, he could never perſwade that aſſertion, no, not to Ariſtotle his own hearer.*

Concerning Plato, Auguſtine ſaith he was *moſt eagerly ſtudious*; and Vives there addeth, that Juſtin Martyr, Euſebius, and Theodoret report, that Plato tranſlated many things out of Hebrew books into his own. And Numenius, a Philoſopher, ſaid, * *What is Plato, but Moſes atticizing, Moſes the Athenian?*

Hierome Dialog. adverſus Pelagianos lib. 1. bringeth in the Orthodoxal (though perſonated) Atticus againſt the feigned hereticall Critobulus, ſaying thus, * *I care not what Ariſtotle, but what Paul teacheth.* And on Eccleſiaſtes 10. 15. *The labour of the fooliſh wearieth every one of them,* * *Reade*, ſaith he, *Plato, peruſe the ſubtilties of Ariſtotle*; and, *That text is fulfilled upon them.* Though there he nibble at Plato, aſwell as he biteth Ariſtotle, yet others have ſtiled him *The divine Plato.* And when Plato ſo often in his works ſaith thus; * *The ancients do affirm, It is in the old Oracles,* and the like; he points not at his maſter Socrates, or the preceding Pythagoras, but to thoſe learned Sages and ancient Magi, who delivered theſe depths to the Egyptians, as they did to him.

Auguſtine thus, *Therefore I was willing to treat of this point with the Platonicks, becauſe their books are better known. For both the Greeks, whoſe tongue excelleth among the Gentiles, have highly extolled them, and alſo the Latines; being moved hereunto, either by their excellency, or by their glory and renown, or by their ſweetneſſe, &c.* So much for the great eſteem of Plato hath Auguſtine. Ludovicus Vives on this place addeth, that from the dayes of Plato and Ariſtotle till the reigne of Severus the Emperour, Ariſtotle was rather named then read or underſtood. Then aroſe Alexander Aphrodiſæus, to expound Ariſtotle: yet Plato was more in requeſt, * *untill Schools were publikely erected in France and Italy, that is, ſo long as the Greek and Latine tongue flouriſhed.* Then falleth an heavy cenſure. * *After that ſciences began*

* *Ariſtoteles animam corruptibilem eſſe impudenter aſſeruit, æquè ac Democritus & Epicurus.*

* *Quinam hodie inveniuntur Stoicæ ſectæ præſidentes? quive etiam ſunt qui Ariſtotelis Stagiritæ doctrinam corroborant? &c. Ac Plato quidem, qui complures ſermones de animæ immortalitate diſſeruit, nè Ariſtoteli quidem, auditori ſuo, perſuaſit eam poſitionem.* Aug. de Civit. Dei lib. 8. cap. 11.

* Τί ἐστι Πλάτων, ἢ Μωσῆς ἀττικίζων;

* *Neque enim mihi curæ eſt, quid Ariſtoteles, ſed quid Paulus doceat.*

* *Lege Platonem, Ariſtotelis revolve verſutias.*

* *Antiqui perhibent: In priſcis habetur Oraculis.*

* *Ideo cum Platonicis placuit hanc cauſam agere, quia eorum ſunt literæ notiores. Nam & Græci, quorum lingua in Gentibus præeminet, eos magnâ prædicatione celebrârunt, & Latini; permoti earum vel excellentiâ, vel gloriâ, vel gratiâ, &c.* Aug. De Civit. 8. 10.

* *Crebrior in manibus hominum & notior, uſque ad Scholas in Gallia & Italia publicè conſtitutas, id eſt, quamdiu Græca & Latina lingua viguerunt.*

began to be theatricall, and all their profit was thought to be able to deceive in disputing, and throw dust before the eyes by a most ignorant dexteritie and with words coyned at pleasure, the Logick and Physick books of Aristotle seemed to be more fit.

And now was Plato not named; and though Vives confesseth he thinketh Aristotle no lesse learned then Plato, yet he calleth Plato *the most holy Philosopher*, nor can endure to have him neglected. And when Scaliger saith, * *They be slaves of small reading, who in divine things preferre Plato before Aristotle*, he speaketh partially, neglecting diviner words of Plato then those cited out of Aristotle, and straining the words cited to a more celestiall sense then ever they were intended: as if Aristotle had a knowledge of the Trinitie, and apprehended it *above humane reach:* and therefore is by him stiled *the divine man.*

Augustine saith, Plato and the Platonicks were so farre preferred before others, in the judgement of posterity, that when Aristotle, a man of excellent wit, and though not comparable to Plato for eloquence, yet surmounting many others, had set up the Peripatetick sect, and (even while his master lived) by his excellent fame * *had gathered very many disciples unto his sect: yet the most noble later Philosophers, whom it pleased to follow Plato, would not be called Peripateticks or Academicks, but Platonicks.* Vives on this place of Augustine confesseth, that Aristotle was before Plato in varietie of knowledge, &c. above most, in wit and industry; above all, skilfull in arts; that the Greeks called Aristotle Δαίμονα· now both the same Greeks called Plato Θεῖον, and the Latines DIVINUM. These things are ill observed by Vives. First, though Laërtius bringeth the saying of Plato, * *Aristotle hath kicked against us, as colts against their damme*; yet others deny that he taught publickly in Platoes life-time. Vives little remembreth, that the precedent words of S. Augustine may incline to the contrarie; besides other authorities, aswell as Laërtius. Secondly, that Augustine his term *hæresis*, in the Greek, is but *secta* in the Latine; yet, by Vives his leave, S. Augustine could & would have said *Congregâsset in suum Lycæum, in suam scholam, partem, sectam, disciplinam*, or any other such word, rather then *in suam hæresim*, unlesse Augustine had intended to lay some aspersion upon Aristotle by the word of *hæresis*, which is homonymous. Thirdly, Vives reporteth, without his authour, that Plato should say of his two disciples, Xenocrates and Aristotle, that the former needed the spurre, and Aristotle the bridle: whereas Cicero in his third book *De Oratore* ascribeth the saying to Isocrates, concerning two of his disciples, Theopompus and Ephorus; *Ephorus the dull, Theopompus the witty and apprehensive:* more distinctly, Suidas saith, it was spoken of Theopompus Chius, not Theopompus Gnidius. Again, Vives is mistaken in taxing

* *Postquam theatricæ cæperunt esse disciplinæ, omnisque earum fructus existimatus est, posse disputando fucum facere & os obturare & pulverē ante oculos jacere, idque imperitissim â peritiâ, & omnibus ad libitum conflictis, accommodatiores ad rem visi sunt libri Logici & Physici Aristotelis.*

* *Mancipia paucæ lectionis, qui in rebus divinis admirantur Platonem Aristoteli.* Jul. Scal. Exercit. 365. sect. 3.

* *Plurimos discipulos in suam hæresin congregâsset: tamen receptiores Philosophi nobilissimi, quibus Plato sectandus placuit, noluerunt se dici Peripateticos aut Academicos, sed Platonicos.* Aug. De Civitate Dei lib. 8. cap. 12.

* *Aristoteles in nos recalcitravit, ut in matrem pulli.*

Plotinus for obſcuritie, * *leſt he ſhould degenerate from the cuſtome of the ſect.* Whereby he would inſinuate, that either Plato was obſcure, or Plotinus, an Ariſtotelian: when S. Auguſtine accounteth Plotinus among the famous Platonicks, in the ſame place; which Suidas alſo confirmeth. For Plotinus his diſciples were the great Origen, and Porphyrius, and divers other famous Platonicks; and as all the Platonicks did Pythagorize, ſo did all the Fathers Platonize; and Plato was in that high eſteem, that it was an ancient Proverb, * *That if Jupiter would ſpeak Greek, he would ſpeak no otherwiſe then Plato.*

I return from the compariſon of Plato with Ariſtotle, and from the oſcitancy of Vives to the old matter.

Strong deluſions rightly befall them, who make Philoſophy equall to Divinity, and aſcribe aſmuch authoritie to Ariſtotle as to Moſes or the Prophets, or to any Apoſtles or Evangeliſts, and who do anſwer their Texts with equall reverence. If they pray to them, or for them, let them ſee to it.

I proceed from the Philoſophicall axiome, *That no Body compounded of contraries can perpetually endure* (which was ſpoken onely of the decayed eſtate, beyond which Philoſophers could not aſpire, and not of the ſtate of integritie, which is our *Quære*; and I come to a paſſage of Divinitie tending that way. It is true, that Adam was made of earth, or rather *of the duſt of the ground*, Geneſ. 2. 7. of the worſt of the elements, and the worſt part of it: *God framed man duſt of the ground*, as it is there in the Original: *Not of the duſt, or earth of Paradiſe, but of other earth, as it is in the Chaldee Targum*, ſaith Vives: of earth ſevered and diſtinct from that bleſſed garden. Cornelius à Lapide the Jeſuit ſaith, *Drie duſt was unfit for to be formed*; as if God could not work but like a potter, by fit and neceſſary materialls: and he citeth Tertullians words, *God by adding ſome fat liquour, cruddled it into ſlime and clay, as it were.* I ſay, though God had done ſo, yet he could have done otherwiſe; he could have made Man of water without earth, or of earth without water, or of any ſome-thing, or of nothing. I will confeſſe *de facto*, with Auguſtine, it was *wet duſt*, becauſe it is ſaid, Geneſ. 2. 6. *There went up a miſt from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground*; (Auguſtine readeth it, *Fons aſcendebat*: the Chaldee Paraphraze hath it, *Nubes*; but properly it is a vapour or a miſt) and immediately, *The Lord formed Man.* Now it was of earth out of Paradiſe: for *the Lord took the Man,* (therefore he was before created) *and put him into the garden, to dreſſe it, and keep it*, Geneſ. 2. 15. (therefore he was out of it ere he was put into it) & after Adam ſinned, *God ſent Adam forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground*, or that ground, *from whence he was taken*, Geneſ. 3. 23. (therefore the ground from whence he was taken, was a different ground from Eden, from whence he was

* *Nè degueraret à more ſectæ.*

* *Jovem, Græcè loqui ſi vellet, non aliter loquuturum quàm Platonem.*

Vives in Aug. De Civit. 13. 24 *Pulvis aridus inidoneus erat ad plaſmandum.*

Deus addito opimo liquore, in limum & quaſi argillam coagulavit.

Pulvis humectus. Aug. De Civit. 13. 24.

he was expelled; and so Adam was not molded or framed of the earth or dust of Paradise. All this being granted, I say, God could frame as lasting and as good a body, and as durable against the force of contrarietie, of the dust out of Paradise, as of the dust of the Garden. And questionles Adam was made of the earth before it was cursed, and why not then equall to the earth of Paradise? So that my Position is not yet shaken, *The contrarie disposition of the elements had not forced dissolution, but Adam had an immortall body.* Which that you may the rather beleeve, let me confirm it by reason and authoritie.

3. The first reason is this; Death cometh not but by outward violence, or inward distemper: in which regard, Death is divided by Aristotle into these two branches, *Violent, Naturall.* But Adam should not have been subject to externall or internall force, or dyscrasie, if he had not sinned: Therefore he had a bodie that, during innocency, was immortall, and not subject to death. The Assumption is onely questionable. Concerning the former member of it, I evidence it thus: Before Man was created, the dominion over the Creatures was reserved for him, and fore-promised Genes. 1.26. so soon as he was created, the dominion was assigned over to him, verse. 28. And if no beast hurt Noah, or his familie in the Ark (though everie Creature imitated Adam, and rebelled against him their Lord, as he did against his Lord God) much lesse could they have hurt Adam persevering in innocencie. During which estate, the lambe and the wolf, the lion and the dragon would not have hurt one another: much lesse would they have hurt Man: least of all, would the issue of Adam have done him violence, or have said as the wicked in the Gospell, *This is the heir, let us kill him, and divide the inheritance,* Matt. 21. 38. For, then there had been no distinction of *Lord, Heir,* and *Servant;* not strife for inheritances.

Arist. lib. *de vita & morte.*

It is too too true, that the higher bodies and the heavenly powers do now, besides their ordinarie influences, sometimes dart down among us hurtfull and noxious qualities, the workers of sicknes and destruction; so that in divers Regions have been *Epidemical & popular diseases: which in the great conjunction of Planets falleth out*, saith Ptolemee, Alcabitius, with other Astronomers. But then the heavens should have dropped plentie, & poured down health, and no bane-full qualitie could have descended from them. As for lightning and thunder, and the now-right-ayming thunderbolts, the armies of Gods wrath and messengers of death, either there should have been none (the aire then needing no purifying) or at least not hurtfull or dangerous.

Lastly, if Satan could have used outward violence, and destroyed Adam or his posteritie that way; perhaps he would

never have brought in Death by the back-doore of ſinne, and never have undermined him by ſuch hidden baits, and lurking temptations.

Likewiſe, inward diſtemper he had none, nor could have: and thus it appeareth;

There is a twofold temperature, { *Uniformis*, all humours being exactly in the ſame degree; *Difformis*, one humour ruling & prevailing over the reſt.

The firſt may be called *temperamentum ad pondus*, which is *proportion Arithmetica*, when all the foure qualities are equally weighed and tempered: ſo that there is no predominancie, no ſuperioritie, nor can be; but all parts are equipondiall and even.

The ſecond is termed *temperamentum ad juſtitiam*, which is *Geometrica proportio*, when the foure qualities hang unevenly in the balance, yet fitted to the beſt ſervice and uſe of the body. Whether of theſe two tempers was in Adam, I will not define; But if there were in his bodie *difforme temperamentum*, it was ſo perfect, yea equal in inequalitie, as was fit for ſuch a bodie, as might be fit for ſuch a ſoul: & ſuch was the mixture of humours, by the divine hand of God compounding them, that both he and we ſhould have lived, in the flower of youth, for ever, if Adam had not offended. What the bodilie conſtitution of the firſt Adam was, may be thought to be the ſame or the like of the ſecond Adam: to whom the Pſalmiſt ſingeth, Pſal. 45. 2. *Pulchruiſti præ filijs hominum, Thou art fairer then the children of men: Perpulchruiſti*, as Vatablus rendereth it: which can not be ſo properly underſtood of Solomon, as of Chriſt: who not onely ſuperabounded in all vertues, (and *vertue is fairer then the morning-ſtarre*, ſaith Ariſtotle) but alſo in all comely proportion, and bodilie beautie. *Then the children of men: why not then the Angels? What means he by ſaying, Then the children of men, but becauſe he is a man?* as S. Auguſtine on the place reaſoneth moſt acutely; inferring, that not Chriſts divinitie, but even his humane nature is in this place commended for beautie. Though the Prophet ſaith of him, Eſai. 53. 2. *He had no form nor comelines*, yet he ſpeaketh it in the perſon of the Jews, and *as they thought*, ſaith Hierome on the place: Or, he had no comelines in his own apprehenſion, as Chriſt himſelf in great humilitie might undervalue his own worth. Thirdly, I may expound all paſſages ſeeming to vilifie Chriſts bodily ſhape, onely comparatively, with reference unto his divinitie; thus the bodily beautie of Chriſt is not to be nam'd, or to ſtand in competition with the Deitie. Fourthly, and moſt properly, in my opinion, Eſai deſcribeth Chriſt as he was to be in his Agonie and Paſſion; his body rent and torn with rods, ſo rufully, that David in the firſt and literal ſenſe (if not in that ſenſe onely) compareth the tor-

men

* *Præ filiis hominum; quare & non præ Angelis? quid voluit dicere præ filiis hominum, niſi quia homo?*

mentors to plowers, and the dintes, impreſſions, and the bruiſed bloudy concavities and ſlices, to furrows, *The plowers plowed upon my back and made deep furrows*: his face ſpit upon, his temples gored and bleeding by the Crown of thorns which was not onely platted on his head, but faſtned in it by the beating with canes; his body black-and-blew by their ſtriking; his hands and feet digged throughout with great nails, that I may uſe the metaphor of the Pſalmiſt, rather digged, *foderunt*, then pierced, to ſhew the latipatencie of his wounds; his ſide ſo rent a ſunder, ſo broad and wide, that Thomas thruſt his hand into it. Take Chriſt, as bearing our griefs, as wounded for our tranſgreſsions, as bruiſed for our ſinnes, as weltered in his ſtreaming blood, I will ſay as Eſai ſaid of him; or as the Pſalmographiſt, *I am a worm, and no man; a reproach of men, and deſpiſed of the people*, Pſal. 22. 6.

But conſider him before his Paſsion; **There ſhined ſome ſtarrie thing in his face*, ſaith S. Hierome, *and his whole body was beautifull, becauſe formed by the power of the holy Ghoſt; in whoſe work there can be no errour nor defect*, ſaith Lyranus. *Thou art fairer then the children of Adam* (ſo it is in the Originall) Auguſtine, Caſsiodorus on the place, and Chryſoſtom Homil. 18 on Matth. expound it of Chriſts corporeall feature. I think I may ſay, if Chriſt exceeded not Adam, yet he was equall to him. The firſt Adam was made out of virginall duſt, the ſecond out of virginal fleſh and bloud; both of them being framed by the miraculous hand of God: but miracles do more exceed naturalls, then naturalls do artificialls. *What is thy beloved more then another beloved, O thou faireſt among women?* ſay the daughters of Jeruſalem to the Church, their Mother, Cant. 5. 9. She anſwereth in the next verſe, *My beloved is white and ruddy; a goodly perſon* (as the Biſhops Bible readeth it) or, as the late Tranſlation hath it; *the chiefeſt among ten thouſand*. Whether beautie be to be defined *Aptneſſe of parts with ſome pleaſantneſſe of colour*, as S. Auguſtine opineth, or, *A convenient medly of white and red eſpecially*, as from this place may ſeem probable; certain it is; Chriſt wanted no comelines, nor beautie; though he had no womaniſh or effeminate ſhape, but *ſuch as was moſt befitting a man*, ſaith Gregorie de Valentia. *Thou art beautifull, O my love, as Tirzah, comely as Jeruſalem*, Cant. 6. 4. and, *Thou art all fair, there is no ſpot in thee*, Cant 4. 7. In which regard, perhaps, it was, that though the humors of Chriſts body did increaſe with the increaſe of his bodie, and grew up from infancie to puerilitie, from it to juvenilitie, thence to virilitie; yet there was ſo harmonious a proportion, if not of weight, yet of juſtice, that we read not any one part of Chriſts bodie to have been out of tune, excepting in his Agonie and Paſsion, when his very bones were out of joint: nor is he recorded to have

* *In ejus facie ſyderéum quiddam illuxit. Totum ejus corpus fuit ſpecioſum; quia formatum virtute Spiritus Sancti, in cujus opere non poteſt eſſe error aut defectus.* Lyran. in Pſ. 45.

* *Partium congruentia cum quadam coloris ſuavitate.* Aug. De Civit. 22. 19.

Tom 4. Diſput. 1. quæſt. 14. punct. 2.

Non ſuſcepit infirmitates individui, ſed ſpecici.

have been ſick at any time, nor ſo much as inclining to ſicknes, all his life. He took not upon him the infirmities of particular men, but of mankinde: as to be weary, to mourn, to weep, to be hungry, thirſtie, to ſuffer, to die. As for ſinne and diſeaſes flowing from ſinne, he was ſubject to none, nor to perſonall defects; but onely to the generall defects of humane bodies. Indeed it is ſaid, Eſai 53. 4. *Surely he took our infirmities, and bare our ſickneſſes:* but Baſil expounds it thus, *He bare our ſickneſſes; not that he did transferre them upon himſelf, but becauſe he healed thoſe that were ſick* Where he ſemes to remove all ſicknes from Chriſt.

οὐκ ἐν τῷ εἰς ἑαυτὸν ὑποδέχεσθαι ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ τῷ τοὺς πάσχοντας θεραπεύειν. Baſ. in Regulis brevioribus quæſt. 177.

Beſides Adam his excellent temper, conſider his food; he had all the trees of the garden for meat, except the forbidden one. The healthie waters about Paradiſe he had for drink: Wholſome things he knew from hurtfull (if any hurtfull things were:) His giving them names doth prove, that he was acquainted with their natures. As for taking too much or too little, it could not be, whileſt his ſoul was innocent and ſpotleſſe. For he had originall juſtice, which in the uſe of lawfull meats ſhould ſubject his ſenſes and his appetite unto reaſon. As for clothing, he needed it not: Innocency apparelled him, till he put off the robe of righteouſnes; and ſo it ſhould have continued. Laſtly, as Adam in Paradiſe had a deep ſleep which fell upon him, Geneſ. 2. 21. which, I confeſſe, was extraordinarie; ſo Auguſtine, Tertullian, and the School after them, do yeeld, that ordinarie ſleep was not excluded out of Paradiſe; but in the night he was allowed ſleep. So that Adam enjoying all things neceſſarie, delightfull, or convenient, which concerned his bodie, we may ſafely conclude the firſt reaſon, That ſince neither outward force, nor inward diſtemper could befall Adams body, if he had continued in innocencie, his body ſhould never have taſted of death; and ſo was, and ſo ſhould have been immortall. And this will yet more plainly appeare, if we will weigh the reaſons following.

Aug. De Civ. t. 14. 16. Tertul. De Anima. cap. 24.

4. Among the trees of the garden there was the tree of life, which Adam had libertie freely to eat of.

Some think it was appointed as a means to tranſlate Adam to immortalitie without ſicknes or death. Others ſay, it would hinder the loſſe of naturall heat and radicall moiſture: whereby though yeares or age, yet weaknes, or decrepitnes ſhould not come nigh him. Others ſay, that it being once taſted ſhould bring perfect immortalitie, even ſuch immortalitie as we ſhall have after the Reſurrection. See Bellarmine *de Gratia primi hominis*, cap. 28. and Mr. Salkeld in his Treatiſe *of Paradiſe*, where in ſome whole Chapters he hath laborioufly collected, and copiouſly explained the various opinions concerning the tree of life. Take my gleanings after their full vintage, and taſte what I have gathered.

Though

Though Lumbard, Sent. 2. Dist. 29. Lit. F. questioneth, Whether Adam before his sinne did eat of the tree of life, and out of Augustine concludeth there, That they did eat; as it was commanded, that they should eat of every tree, save one: yet I can no way agree with him. This his errour is grounded on an other, which he hath cited Distinct. 9. of the same book, in the letters B and C, That Adam was commanded to eat of the tree of life; and that he should have sinned, if he had not used it. For first, It was not a command, but a permission. God gave the use of the tree no otherwise to man, Genes. 1. 29. then to the beasts and fowls the green herbs, verse 21: but this was by way of indulgence, not of command. Secondly, Genes. 2. 16. *Of every tree of the garden thou may'st freely eat.* And though it be in the Hebrew, *Eating thou shalt eat*, yet it implieth no absolute precept. Thirdly, Genes. 3. 2. the woman saith, *We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden*; she saith not, *We must eat*, or *We are charged*; much lesse, *presently, so soon as we see them*, or *before we do other things*. Fourthly, Genes. 9. 3. *Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things.* Are we commanded to eat every beast, and every herb? then whosoever forbeareth any one, sinneth. Or was there in this a difference between the grant unto Adam, and the grant unto Noah, and their posterities?

The second errour is of Lumbard, That Adam did eat of the tree of life. His proof out of Augustine falleth short, even as it is cited, though the place is mistaken by him, and the words maym'd. Indeed Augustine thus. * *Certainly it is well thought, that our first parents, before that malicious persuasion, did abstain from the forbidden food, and used such things as were granted them, and consequently the rest, specially the tree of life.* * Note first, He saith *granted*, not *commanded*: as Noah ate not of every thing granted to him, yet Noah spent many hundred yeares more time after the Floud, then Adam did in Paradise. Neither can I think Adam in that estate so addicted to his belly, that he in so short a time would eat of so many, of all, and every tree. Secondly, Rupertus saith, *The eating of the tree of life but once, had made them live for ever.* Augustine moreover addeth, *It is no where read in Genesis, that Adam in Paradise did not eat of the fruit of the tree of life*; of which place by and by. Now as Augustine is directly against me in the second point, he is as directly against them in the first point: * *They had received power to eat of every fruit that was in Paradise.* To strengthen their side, Augustine annexeth this reason, *What is more absurd then to beleeve that he would eat of other trees, and not of that?* saith Augustine. I answer, perchance Adam thought that he had no need of that tree, as yet, as knowing both that he should not die, if he did not sinne, and that the time of his translation was not come. Nor did those

*Rectè profectò intelliguntur primi homines, ante malignam persuasionem, abstinuisse à cibo vetito, atque usi fuisse concessis; ac per hoc, & cæteris, & præcipuè ligno vitæ. De peccat. Meritis & Remis. 2. 21.

Rup. in Genes. l. 3. cap. 30.

Aug. Cont. Adversar. Legis & Prophet. 1. 15

*Utendi ad escam omni ligno, quod in Paradiso erat, acceperant potestatem. Ibidem.

thoſe or the like thoughts ſavour of ſinne, or ignorance. Auguſtine in this point is incoherent to himſelf, ſaying, * *The taſte of the tree of life did hinder the corruption of the body.* Again, * *The tree of life, by way of phyſick, did prevent all corruption.* But, ſay I, if corruption ſeiſed not on Adam, till he ſinned; what needed Adam, till he ſinned, uſe that medicine? ſince the ſick have need of phyſician and phyſick, and not the whole. If Adam had eaten of the tree of life before he had eaten the forbidden fruit, God would have kept him from the forbidden fruit, as after he kept him from the tree of life: or els the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good & evill had not cauſed deſtruction, the apple had not been deadly; but Adam ſhould have lived immortally. This will not ſeem ſtrange, if you weigh what followeth.

If after Adam had ſinned, he had taken of the tree of life, and eaten the fruit; he had lived for ever, Geneſ. 3. 22. for els, what needed God to have placed ſuch a watch and ward againſt him? Again, if Adam might have lived everlaſtingly, for all Gods threat, yea though he had now a dead body, when God debard him from the tree of life, if he had but eaten of it, he ſhould alſo have lived for ever, if he had eaten of it before he ſinned. But, ſaith Auguſtine, * *After ſinne Adam might have remained indiſſoluble, if God had given him leave to eat of the tree of life.* The concluſion reacheth home againſt Auguſtine, That Adam ate not of the tree of life, before he ate of the forbidden fruit. I think the malice of Satan egged Adam on to taſte firſt of the unlawfull fruit, the uſher of death, though the tree of life ſtood next unto it (for both the tree of life was in the midſt of the garden, Geneſ. 2. 9. and the tree of knowledge of good and evill was alſo in the midſt of the garden, as appeareth in the ſame place, and more plainly Geneſ. 3. 3.) If any be ſo curious, as to enquire what was the form and figure of the garden of Eden, when two trees are juſt in the midſt of it; I anſwer, We muſt not take the word *Midſt* ſtrictly or Mathematically, but at large, or Rhetorically. When the Shunamite ſaid, *In medio populi ego habitans ſum*, it is well rendred by our late Tranſlatours, *I dwell among mine own people*; not as if the words inforced, that ſhe dwelt exactly in the midſt of them. The like Hebraiſm is uſed by Abraham, Geneſ. 18. 24. *Si fortè fuerint quinquaginta juſti in medio civitatis*; that is, *Fiftie righteous within the citie*; not as if all the fiftie dwelt together in the exact middle of the citie. David alſo uſeth the like phraſe, Pſal. 102. 24. *Take me not away in the midſt of my dayes:* in which place, as well as in the propounded difficultie, we muſt not be too ſtrict or rigorous upon the letter. The like is in Eſay 5. 8.

The laſt touch we will give at this point is thus; God turned Adam and Eve out of Paradiſe, and by Cherubims and a ſword kept away the tree of life; ſo that neither Adam, nor his poſteritie

* *Guſtus arboris vitæ corruptionem corporis inhibebat.*
* *Vitæ arbor, medicinæ modo, corruptionem omnem prohibebat.*

* *Poſt peccatum, Adam potuit indiſſolubilis manere ſi à Domino permiſſum illi eſſet edere de arbore vitæ.* Aug. lib. quæſt. Vet. & Novi Teſtam. c. 19. Tom. 4.

2. Kings 4. 13.

ritie ſhould be able to approach it. And perhaps the Cherubims were purpoſely placed to confront Satan and his evill Angels, leſt they might bring to Adam and Eve, or to their poſteritie, the fruit of the tree of life: for if we had been immortally miſerable & curſed, as Satan himſelf is, was as much as he deſired. So great a vertue had the tree of life, if once it had been eaten.

Let me adde in the third place, If Adam had not ſinned at all, nor at all eaten of the tree of life, yet he had not died: for death was appointed for ſinne and for nothing els. Bonaventure ſaith, * *It is impoſſible that innocencie and the puniſhment of corruption ſhould ſtand together.*

* *Impoſſibile eſt ut ſimul conſiſtant innocentia & corruptionis pœna.* Bonav. in 2. Sent. diſt. 19. art. 2.

But to what uſe was then the tree of life? The queſtion was made of old by an adverſarie to the Law and the Prophets: * *That tree which bare fruit of life in Paradiſe, to whom was it profitable?* I confeſſe Auguſtine anſwereth, *To whom but firſt to our firſt Parents, the man and the woman placed in Paradiſe?* But that is the point to be proved. Again, Auguſtine there ſaith, *Enoch and Elias eat of that tree, but* (ſaith he) *we muſt not haſtily ſay that any other eateth of it*: but how unlikely are theſe things? The adverſarie of the Law and the Prophets might better have been anſwered, That there was no more uſe of that tree, then of others which were untaſted (for no man can think, that they taſted of every one in ſo ſhort a time.) Or what inconvenience ariſeth if we ſay, A profered curteſy not accepted came to nothing? What can the adverſarie conclude from thence? for God profereth ſalvation and the means thereof to many, who do not accept of it; the fault being on Mans part, and not on Gods

* *Iſta arbor quæ in Paradiſo fructus vitæ ferebat, cui prodeſſet?*

To finiſh this point, I reſolve, There was no uſe made of the tree of life, as it fell out. If it be further queſtioned, What might have been the uſe thereof? I anſwer, That the exact ſpecialties can not punctually be known. Probable it is, that the tree of life might have conferred much to the exiſtence of life, though not to the eſſence. Adam ſhould have lived howſoever, and that immortally, if he had not tranſgreſſed Gods commandement: the tree of life might have been conducible to his better being; yea to his beſt being: by it he might have been changed from his terreſtriall not-dying eſtate, or immortall life, to a celeſtiall; and not onely an immortall, but an unchangeable eternall life. In which regard, perchance, the tree of life is ſtiled Geneſ. 3.22. *The tree* עֵץ הַחַיִּים *hachajim, of lives*, as profitable (if taſted) both to Adams preſent life, which was in time to have its *conſummantem finem*, though not *conſumentem*; its end, though not its death; and alſo to his future and more happie life, which ſhould never have end. I ſumme up all with Auguſtines words, * *There was meat, leſt Adam ſhould hunger; drink, leſt he ſhould thirſt; a tree of life, leſt old age ſhould diſſolve him: no inward diſeaſe, no outward blow was feared.*

* *Cibus aderat, nè Adam eſuriret; potus, nè ſitiret; lignum vitæ, nè illum ſenecta diſſolveret: nullus intrinſecus morbus, nullus ictus metuebatur extrinſecus.* De Civit. 14. 20.

A new

A new Quære may be made, Whether if Adam after his ſin had eaten of the tree life, his poſteritie as well as himſelf had lived for ever? My anſwer ſetleth on the negative; becauſe Adams action had been perſonall, not repreſentative or ideall; and his poſteritie was neither to anſwer for his ſecond ſinne, or after-offences, nor to have received any benefit by his good deeds ſucceeding his fall: but he ſtood alone for us, and we were in him onely as he had power to keep or break the firſt commandement.

And now am I come to the ſecond Topick place, by which I undertook to prove that Adams body had been immortall, if he had not ſinned; and that is Authoritie.

5. Not S. Auguſtine alone, but a whole Councell where he was preſent, towit the Milevitan Councell, is ſtrong on our ſide.* *Whoſoever ſhall ſay that the firſt man Adam was made mortall, ſo that whether he had ſinned or no, he ſhould have died in body, that is, gone out of the body; not for the deſert of ſinne, but by the neceſſitie of nature; let him be accurſed.* And this curſe fell heavy upon the Pelagians, who did think that Adam ſhould have died, though he had not ſinned: for ſo they held, ſaith* Auguſtine. Cajetan thus:* *In the ſtate of innocencie Adam had a corruptible body, in regard of the flux of naturall moiſture, but not mortall.* Richeomus a Jeſuit ſaith,* *If man was created mortall, thoſe threatnings whereby God did denounce death unto him, were unprofitable; for Adam might have anſwered, I know well enough that I ſhall die, although I neither taſte nor touch the tree of knowledge of good & evill.* And again; *God in the production of every one of his works, kept an exact and moſt beautifull ſymmetry between the matter and the form, the body and the ſoul, and ſuch a ſymmetrie as was moſt fit and accommodate to** *obtain the end of everie creature, furniſhing the matter with qualities and inſtruments moſt apt and pliable to ſerve the vertues and faculties of the form. Therefore the ſoul of man being immortall, and the faculties and operations proportioned to the eſſence, the body alſo then muſt needs be immortall.* Item, *In every good marriage two things are obſerved at leaſt; the qualities of the parties, and their age. Therefore unto the ſoul, which is free from the tyranny of death, God married the body, which was free alſo from the grave-clothes and bands of death. Death is the brood of ſinne*, ſaith Julianus Pomerius; & *Adam was ſo created,* that having diſcharged his duty of obedience, without the intervention of death he ſhould have been followed of Angelicall immortality and bleſſed eternity.* He had immortalitie, yet changeable; not Angelicall and eternall. As I began with S. Auguſtine, ſo with him will I end: *It is a conſtat among Chriſtians holding the Catholick Faith,* that even the death of the body hath been inflicted upon us, not by the law of nature, but by the deſert of ſinne.* Otherwhere he ſaith, * *Sinne is the father of death.* Again,* *If Adam had not ſinned, he was not to be ſtripped of his*

*Quicunque dixerit Adam primum hominem mortalem factum, ità ut ſive peccaret, ſive non peccaret, moreretur in corpore, hoc eſt, de corpore exiret; non peccati merito, ſed neceſſitate naturæ; Anathema ſit. *Lib. de Hæreſibus cap. 88.

* In 1. Cor. 15. 53.

* *In ſtatu innocentiæ Adam corpus habebat corruptibile, quantum ad fluxum humidi naturalis, ſed non mortale.*

* *Si homo mortalis creatus fuit, inutiles erant illæ minæ, quibus Deus mortem illi intendebat; poterat namq; reſpondere, &c.* In Valedictione animæ devotæ, Colloq. 32.

* Colloq. 34.

* *Ad cujuſque creaturæ finem conſequendum.*

* Colloq. 35.

* *Ut perfunctus obedientiæ munere, ſine interventu mortis Angelica eum immortalitas, & æternitas ſequeretur beata.*

* *Etiam ipſam nobis corporis mortem, non lege naturæ, ſed merito inflictam eſſe peccati.* De Civit. Dei. 13. 15.

* *Peccatum eſt pater mortis.*

of his body, but clothed upon with immortalitie, that mortalitie might be ſwallowed up of life, that is, that he might paſſe from a naturall to a ſpiritual eſtate, from an earthly to an heavenly, from a mortal to an immortall, as I truly interpret his meaning. For he taketh not *Mortall* for that which muſt die. And Again, * *It was not to be feared, if Adam had lived longer, that he ſhould have been troubled with age, or death: For if God was ſo gratious to the Iſraëlites, that for fourty yeares their clothes waxed not old upon them, nor their ſhoes waxed old upon their feet, Deuter. 29. 5. what marvell were it, if God granted to obedient Adam, * that having a naturall and mortall body he ſhould have in it ſome ſtate and condition, that he might be old without imperfection, and at what time it pleaſed God, he ſhould come from mortalitie to immortalitie, * without paſsing through death?* Where though S. Auguſtine ſeemes to ſay, Adam had a mortall body, and ſhould have paſſed from mortalitie; yet he taketh *Mortale* for all one with *Animale*, and oppoſeth it to *Spirituale*. So that I confeſſe, Adam in Paradiſe had not a ſpirituall body, not ſuch a bodie as he and we ſhall have after the Reſurrection. And thus the body which he had, may be called *Animale* or *Mortale*: and yet S. Auguſtine with us, and we with him, acknowledge this truth, that the body of Adam could not have died, if he had not ſinned: and in that regard Adams body may be juſtly termed *immortall*, not with reference to that heavenly and ſpirituall bodie which he ſhall have hereafter; but *immortall* therefore, becauſe (except for ſinne) his body (as it was) was free from death. And the ſame Auguſtine hath a whole Chapter intituled thus, * *Againſt the doctrines of thoſe that beleeve not, that the firſt men had been immortall, if they had not ſinned.*

Among ſuch a troup, may I put in ſomewhat unthought of by others? Some have ſaid truly, that the divine providence, and preſerving power, which extendeth to the leaſt things in our declined eſtate, as to the lives of birds and beaſts and the fall of every hair (God not being * *leſſe in the leaſt things, then* he was *in the greateſt*, and governing *all things in number, weight, and meaſure*) would have much more watcht over Adam and his ofſpring, continuing perfect. But this is that which I propoſe, Whether the good Angels did immediatly miniſter unto Adam in his integritie, and ſhould have done unto us, to keep mankinde from harm? To which I anſwer, That ſince the Prophet, Pſal. 91. 11, deſcribing the bleſſed eſtate of the godly, maketh this one eſpeciall branch, *He ſhall give his Angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy wayes*; and verſe 12. *They ſhall bear thee up in their hands, leſt thou daſh thy foot againſt a ſtone:* I can not but think that the ſame Angels ſhould have watcht over us, and friendly converſed with us in our innocencie. For God reduceth * *the loweſt things to the higheſt by the middle*, working by ſubordination of cauſes. Yea, grant that this is ſpoken of the

* *Si non peccâſſet Adam non erat expoliandus corpore, ſed ſuperveſtiendus immortalitate ut abſorberetur mortale à vita, id eſt, ab animali ad ſpirituale tranſiret, à terreno ad cæleſte, à mortali ad immortale.* De peccat. Merit. & Remiſ. l. 1. cap. 2.

* Ibid. cap. 3.

* *Vt animale ac mortale habens corpus, haberet in eo quendam ſtatum.*

* *Sine media morte?*

* *Contra eorum dogmata, qui primos homines, ſi non peccâſſent, immortales futuros fuiſſe non credunt.* De Civit. 13. 19.

* *Deus non minor eſt in minimis quàm in maximis.*

* *Infima ad ſuprema per media.*

Sonne of God onely, (which by the Evangeliſts Matt. 4.6. and Luke 4.9. ſeemeth to be the Devils argute inference) yet it excludes not their watching over us, and their miniſterie (if we had not fallen) whoſe very office and name conſiſt in being *miniſtring Spirits: All being ſent forth to miniſter for them who ſhall be heirs of ſalvation*, Heb. 1. 14. which out of doubt both Adam and his iſſue, continuing in perfection, ſhould have been. But leaving theſe things, Chriſts anſwer to Satan proves, that unto whom theſe words were ſaid, *He ſhall give his Angels charge over thee*, &c. unto the ſame was alſo ſaid, *Thou ſhalt not tempt the Lord thy God*, Matt. 4. 7. which was not ſpoken to Chriſt alone or principally, but in the plurall number to the Iſraëlites and others ſucceeding them, as appeareth Deuter. 6. 16. *Ye ſhall not tempt the Lord your God, as ye tempted him in Maſſah.* They are deceived, whoſoever imagine the miniſterie of Angels ſhould not have been any way neceſſarie, if Adam had not ſinned; ſince Chriſt (the immaculate Lambe of God, who ſinned not, nor could ſinne) refuſed not their miniſterie, Matth. 4. 11. and comfort or ſtrength, Luke 22. 43; and ſince one Angel ſtrengthneth himſelf with an other, Dan. 10. 21. and Revel. 12. 7; and ſince they might have miniſtred more matter of joy unto us, by their moſt familiar converſation in aſſumed bodies.

Unto theſe authorities let me adde two memorable places out of the Apocrypha. The firſt is, Wiſd. 1. 13. *God made not death*: Satan begot it, ſinne brought it forth, Adam and Eve nurſt it. The other paſſage is in Wiſd. 2. 23. *God created man* ἐπ' ἀφθαρσίᾳ, *to be immortall, & made him an image of his own eternity*. On which words Holcot thus, *Corporeall creatures have onely a footſtep of God: Man is the image of God.* Again, * *On Gods part, he created him unperiſhable according to the body.* And there he hath a large diſcourſe, proving, howſoever Ariſtotle (Metaph. 8.) defineth Man to be *a reaſonable creature mortall*, that the oppoſite is true, and he reſteth in it. For Ariſtotle knew not Adams innocencie, but ſpake of us as we are in the ſtate of ſin. Whoſoever deſireth to read more curioſities ſtrange and learned, concerning the bodily immortalitie of Adam, at the Creation, let him read Eſtius on the ſecond of the Sent. Diſtinct. 19.

* Quantum fuit ex parte Dei, creavit hominem inexterminabilem ſecundum corpus.

But to confirm the truth delivered in the book of Wiſdome, the laſt and the beſt kinde of authoritie ſhall be produced out of the unqueſtionable Canon: death is ſtiled our *Enemy*, 1. Corinth. 15. 26. ἐχθρὸς, *inimicus*, as Hierome on the 27. of Eſai readeth it: *hoſtis*, ſaith Valla: therefore death is not naturall or kindly to us, but rather a conſort, and fellow-ſouldier of Satan and ſinne, who fight againſt us. But the ſharp-pointed places are in Geneſ. 2. 17. *In the day that thou eateſt thereof, thou ſhalt ſurely die*; or, *dying thou ſhalt die. Mortalis eris*, as Symmachus well tranſlates it; or *morti obnoxius*, as Auguſtine well expounds it: and Geneſ. 3. 3

Ye ſhall not touch it, leſt ye die: therefore they ſhould not have died, if they had not touched the forbidden fruit. And ſo they both were, and ever might have been immortall.

When the woman of Sarepta ſaid to Eliah,* *Art thou come unto me to call my ſinne to remembrance, and to ſlay my ſonne?* doth ſhe not ſecretly intimate, that ſinne is a murtherer? And if there had been no ſinne, there had alſo been no death, in and by her evident confeſſion that her ſinne was the cauſe of his death. Scotus ſhall determine the point; *Puniſhment can not be without fault: but death is the puniſhment of ſinne; and during the ſtate of innocency there could be no ſinne: therefore no death.*

I have dwelt the longer on this part, becauſe every reaſon & authoritie by which I have proved, that Adams bodilie eſtate in the time of innocency was immortall, affordeth alſo, by way of preparative, a binding argument, to evince that Adam for ſin was appointed to die; which is the firſt of the two Propoſitions which I propounded. In which words we intend to handle theſe things: Firſt, ſomewhat concerning death; Secondlie, that Adam was appointed to die for one ſinne onely; Thirdly, that it was for Adams own ſinne onely, and not for Eves; Fourthly, we will enquire what that ſinne was.

*1. Kings 17.18.

*In 2. Sent. diſt. 19. quæſt. 1.

O Onely-wiſe God, who created ſt Man in thine own likenes, and mad'ſt him the Image of thine own eternitie: I beſeech thee, to renew in me that decaied Image; make me like unto thee: give me the favour to taſte of the Tree of Life, which is in the midſt of the Paradiſe of God, and to drink of the pure River of the Water of Life, clear as Cryſtall, proceeding out of the Throne of God, and of the LAMBE. Heare me, O bleſſed SAVIOUR, for thine infinite Merit, and mercies ſake. Amen.

CHAP. III.

1. *Death is a bitter-ſweet. Enoch and Elias Raptures were not painfull to them. Chriſts Transfiguration, and the manner of it. That it was not painfull to him. Adams tranſlation to a life celeſtiall and a body ſpirituall, ſhould not have been painfull, if he had not ſinned. They who ſhall be changed at Chriſts coming, ſhall by it finde no pain. Death is painfull.*

2. *Man-kinde died the firſt minute of their ſinne. God draweth good out of evill. Death in ſome regard is changed, from a puniſhment to be a favour and bleſſing of God.*

3. *Not many or more ſinnes, but one cauſed death. One onely. David begotten in lawfull wedlock. That this one ſinne is not leſſe in the godly, nor greater in the wicked. Death was appointed for one ſinne onely, of one perſon onely.*

4. *This one perſon onely was Man: this Man that ſinned that one ſinne, was Adam. Strange and curious ſpeculations, that Eve ſinned not that ſinne for which man-kinde was appointed to death.*

5. *Two Schoole-ſpeculations propounded. The ſecond handled at large, as expounding the former, and determined againſt the Schoolmen themſelves, viz.* That the children of innocent Adam had been born confirm'd in grace. *The cenſure of Vives upon theſe and the like points. A part of his cenſure cenſured.*

1. CONcerning Death, I mean in this place to touch onely the ſtrange medly that is mixed in it, of {Sower. {Sweet.

The ſowernes or bitternes of death is diſcerned, becauſe that manner of ſeceſſion or departure is onely painfull; whereas all other approaches unto glorie, all other ſtairs, ſteps, and means, inducing to bleſſednes, are void of pain.

Let us ſee it exemplified in Enoch; *He walked with God, and was not; for God took him.* Geneſ. 5. 24. His manner of not-being, as he was before (whatſoever it were, or howſoever) was never held painfull. Secondly, the chariot of fire, and the horſes of fire, which parted Eliah and Eliſha both aſunder, 2. Kings 2. 11,

hurt

hurt neither of them: *Elijah*(ſaith the place) *went up by a whirlwinde into heaven*; the very form of words implying a willing-eaſie aſcent: nor did the whirlwinde moleſt him, or pain him, though Eccleſiaſticus 48. 9. it is ſaid, it was *a whirlwinde of fire.*

Chriſts Transfiguration comes next to be conſidered. It was a true repreſentation of that bodilie glorie, which at the recollection & retribution of all Saints, God will adorn and cloth the faithfull withall: Chriſt ſhewing them the mark at which they ought to ſhoot: for we alſo are to be *faſhioned* or configured to his transfiguration, Philip. 3.21.* *As he is to be at the time of judging, ſuch did he appeare to the Apoſtles*, ſaith Hierom on Matth. 17. *And let not man think he loſt his old form and face*, ſaith he, *or took a body ſpirituall or aëriall: the ſplendor of his face was ſeen, and the whitenes of his veſtments deſcribed.* * *The ſubſtance is not taken away, but the glory is changed.* Or that I may utter it in Theophylacts words on Mark 9. 2. *By the transfiguration* (ſo Oecolampadius ſhould tranſlate it) *underſtand not the change of character and lineaments, but the character remaining ſuch as it was before, an increaſe was made of unſpeakable light. This admirable light not coming from without to him as it did to Moſes, but flowing from his divinitie into his humane ſoul, from it into his body, and from it into his very clothes; will you ſay his clothes were changed*, ſaith S. Hierom? *His raiment became ſhining, exceeding white as ſnow: ſo as no fuller on earth can white them*, Mark. 9. 3. *And his face did ſhine as the Sunne*, Matth. 17. 2.

*Qualis futurus eſt tempore judicandi, talis Apoſtolis apparuit.

*Non ſubſtantia tollitur, ſed gloria commutatur.

What S. Chryſoſtom ſaith of the ſpirituall bodies of the Saints, I will much more rather ſay of Chriſts body transfigured(for if ſtarre differeth from ſtarre in glorie, man from man; much more ſhall Chriſt ſhine above all other men, by infinite degrees) *They ſhall ſhine as the Sunne: not becauſe they ſhall not exceed the ſplendor of the ſunne, but becauſe we ſee nothing more bright then the ſunne, he took the compariſon thence. And this ſhining*, ſaith Aquinas, * *was eſſentially a claritie of glory, though not in the manner, ſeeing it was by way of a tranſient paſſion, as the aire is inlightned of the ſunne: whereas* * *to a glorified body claritie from the ſoul doth accrue, as ſome permanent qualitie.* Which eſſentiall claritie Chriſt had from his nativitie, yea from his firſt conception; yet by diſpenſation he ecclipſed it ever, till he had accompliſhed our redemption, except at this time, when appeared a brightnes of glory, though not a brightnes of a glorious body; not imaginary (unleſſe you take imaginary as ſynonymall with repreſentative) but reall, though tranſitorie.

Aquin part. 3. q. 45. art. 2.
*Fuit gloriæ claritas eſſentialiter, licèt non ſecundum modum, cùm fuerit per modum tranſeuntis paſſionis,
*Ad corpus glorificatum redundat claritas ab anima, ſicut qualitas quædam permanens.

Can any one think that herein was any pain, or rather not infinite pleaſure? The beholders rejoyced: they could not do ſo at the pain of Chriſt. If there were any pain or grief, it would rather have been ſo at the withdrawing of his unuſuall clari-

tie: which not being likely, the manifeſtation of this claritie, at this transfiguration, was leſſe likely to be painfull.

The fourth and laſt kinde of degree to happines, is tranſlation; not onely as Enoch was tranſlated, from one life to an other kinde of life, but ſuch a tranſlation as ſhould have been of Adam, if he had not ſinned, and ſhall be of ſuch as ſhall be alive at Chriſts coming. Adams tranſlation had been *ſine media morte.* Nor was his ſlumber painfull, nor *ſolutio continui* at the drawing out of his rib, nor the cloſing of the fleſh again: nor is it likely there was in Adams ſide any ſcar, the badge of pain and ſorrow: much leſſe ſhould he have had pain at his tranſlation. Pain is the grand-child of ſinne, the daughter of puniſhment; from both which the eſtate of innocency was priviledged. *Every thing* in the Creation *was very good,* Geneſ. 1. 31: *Every tree was pleaſant to the ſight, and good for food,* Geneſ. 2.9; and could the tree of life cauſe pain? By taſting the fruit thereof, Adam and his ofſpring had come to an higher and more unchangeable happines. The middeſſe was then proportionate to the beginning, and to the end. Sorrow was part of the curſe: innocency could not feel pain, much leſſe ſhall eternall happines; and ſhould the tree of life have cauſed pain? Then were there little difference between it, and the tree of knowledge of good and evill. Or what difference in that point would there be between Adams death, which was painfull, and his tranſlation, if it ſhould have been painfull? As concerning the tranſlation of them that ſhall be found alive at the laſt day, I am thus conceited: That there ſhall be no true, and reall ſeparation of their ſouls from their bodies; at leaſt, ſo much as concerneth the righteous: That they ſhall be changed: That they ſhall put on immortalitie. If it be delightfull now to our bodies to receive eaſe, ſhall it be painfull to be clothed with incorruptibility? It ſhall be done in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye: *Nolumus expoliari,* ſaith the Apoſtle, ſhewing the unwillingnes of men to die, *ſed ſuperveſtiri deſideramus* or *volumus*; for ſo muſt the Apoſtle be interpreted, as appeareth verſ. 2, *We grone earneſtly, deſiring to be clothed upon.* Tertullian ſaith, **Who deſireth not, being yet in the fleſh, to be clothed upon with immortalitie, and to continue his life gained by a ſubſtituted denunciation of death?* Can ſo bleſſed a change be painfull? or can we naturally deſire pain? ſhall we grone, and grone earneſtly, that we may have pain? Hierome, in his Epiſtle to Minerius and Alexander, ſaith thus of the word *Rapiemur*: * *I think that this word ſheweth a ſudden paſſage to a better place, and that he ſaid he was caught up, to ſignifie that his paſsing was ſwifter then his thinking*; not as if it were painfull to be taken, as I imagine. S. Paul ſpeaketh of this tranſlation and change, as a matter worthie of thanks unto God, 1. Corinth. 15. 51, &c. Onely death, of all other wayes by which God uſeth to call mankinde

2. Cor. 5. 4.

**Quis non deſiderat, adhuc in carne, ſuperinduere immortalitatem, & continuare vitam lucrifactam mortis vicariâ denuntiatione? De Reſur. carnis.*

**Hoc verbo oſtendi puto ſubitum ad meliora tranſcenſum, & ideirco raptum ſe voluiſſe dicere, vt velocitas tranſeuntis ſenſum cogitantis excederet.*

to

to glorie, death onely is painfull. Psal. 116. 3. *The sorrows of death compassed me. God loosed the pains of death*, Act. 2. 24. and Hebr. 2. 15. *Some through fear of death were all their life time subject to bondage.* And indeed this pain of death is part of the curse denounced. But of this point, more hereafter. And thus do I make my approach towards it.

2. *Augustine saith, *When disobedient Adam sinned, then did his body lose the grace of being obedient to his soul. Then arose that bestiall motion, to be ashamed of by men, which he blusht at in his nakednes. Then also, by a certain sicknes taken by a sudden and contagious corruption, it came to passe that the stabilitie of age being lost, in which they were created, by the changes of ages they made a progresse to death. For though they lived many yeares after, yet they began to die the same day when they received the law of death, by which they were to grow old. For whatsoever by a continuall change and degrees runneth unto an end, not perfecting or consummating, stands not a moment, but decayes without intermission. Thus was fulfilled what God said*, Genes. 2. 17. *In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.* So he.

*Aug. De. peccat. Merit. & Remis. 1. 16.

Let me adde my conjecture. First, if God had not called Adam and Eve so sensibly to an account, yet had they died, by vertue of the former sentence. For the later sentence inflicts not death, which was then entred on them, but labour and pain, *In sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the dayes of thy life*, Genes. 3. 17. And though it be said vers. 19. *In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground: for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return:* Yet this is but an explication of the former sentence, shewing that the manner of the death shall be by incineration, which was not so exactly speciallized before. Secondly, the same instant that Adam had eaten, I make no doubt but both their eyes were opened and they knew their nakednes, which was the first sensible degree towards death and corruption. For though the Scripture doth not say expressely, *Immediately their eyes were opened*; yet it implieth so much, as may appeare by the implicative particle *and*, Genes. 3. 6, &c. Eve *did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat, and the eyes of them both were opened*, &c. S. Augustine thus, * *How doth the Apostle say that our body is dead, (Rom. 8. 10.) when he speaks of the living; but because the condition of dying, arising from the sinne of the parents, sticks to the posteritie? So we also die*, or are dying, *the first houre of our being.* And again, * *The body is dead because of sinne. He saith not there, It is mortall, but, dead; albeit it is truely mortall, because it shall die.——So soon as they transgressed the commandment, death like some deadly disease was conceived in their members. For as soon as we were, I will not say born, but even conceived, what did we els but begin a certain sicknes, by which we shall undoubtedly die?* IN THE MIDST OF

* *Quomodo corpus nostrum dicit Apostolus mortuum* (Rom 8. 10.) *cùm adhuc de viventibus loqueretur, nisi quia jam ipsa conditio moriendi ex peccato parentum hæsit in prole?* De Gen. ad lit. 6. 26.

* *Corpus mortuum est propter peccatum: Nec ibi ait Mortale, sed Mortuum; quamvis utiq; & mortale, quia moriturum,——mox ubi præceptum transgressi sunt, eorum membris, velut aliqua ægritudo lethalis, mors ipsa concepta est. Quid enim aliud, non dicam nati, sed omnino concepti, nisi ægritudinem quandam inchoavimus, quâ sumus sine dubio morituri?* Ibid. 9 16

LIFE WE ARE IN DEATH, and now *non vitam vivimus, ſed mortem*; which was toucht at before, and muſt be handled again.

God (who drew light out of darknes, yea all things out of the unformed TOHV-BOHV, and that maſſe or rude lump out of nothing) is ſo good a God, and ſo divine a goodnes, that he would never have ſuffered ſinne in this world, but that he knew how to extract good out of evill, and to turn mans ſinne to his benefit. Neither would he have permitted death to enter upon man, but that he knew how to uſe the ſting of death to mans greater happines, and how to *bring forth meat out of the eater, and ſweetnes out of the ſtrong*, Judg. 14. 14. As of the vipers fleſh is made a preſervative againſt the poiſon of the viper: ſo from this bitter cup of death ariſeth health, joy, and ſalvation to mankinde.

*Auguſtine hath a witty collection from Plato and his follower Plotinus: Plato in Timæo writeth, * *that the ſpirits of men are tied with mortall bands by the leſſer gods.* So Vives on the place citeth Plato, but Plotinus in lib. de dubijs Animæ, as he is alſo cited by Vives, on that place of Auguſtine, thus, * *Father Jupiter, having compaſsion of the afflicted ſouls, hath made their bands ſoluble, wherewith they are wearied.* Theſe quotations at large, give light to S. Auguſtines meaning, which is ſubobſcure: for he ſaith, * *Plotinus is commended for having underſtood Plato above the reſt. He treating of the ſouls of men ſaith, The mercifull Father made them mortall bands.* Whether the particle *Is* aimeth at Plato, or Plotinus, appeareth not by Auguſtine. Bartholomæus *Sibylla appropriateth the word *Is* to Plato; I rather aſsigne it to Plotinus, as the good Expoſitor of Plato: Or it may be that S. Auguſtine, taking ſome words from both of them into one ſentence, purpoſely left it doubtfull, unto whom the *Is* muſt be referred. Howſoever, his collection (as I ſaid) is ingenious and ſubtile; * *So he thought that this very thing, that men are mortall in body, proceeds from the mercie of our divine Father, leſt they ſhould be alwayes held with the miſerie of this life. Even as the very miſerie of mankind, from which no man is free, could not pertain to the juſt judgement of the Almightie, if there had been no originall ſinne*, as Auguſtine ſaith otherwhere. Gods judgement brought miſerie and death for ſinne: yet in death God remembred mercie, & diſtilled good out of it, I cannot omit this memorable ſpeech of Gregory *Nazianzen, *Adam was expelled and extruded from this tree of life & from Paradiſe at once, by God, for ſinne:— And yet even in this caſe by death he gaineth the cutting off of ſinne, leſt the evill ſhould be immortall. So was puniſhment turned into mercy.* He is excellently ſeconded by Rupert, * *How ſhould we turn away with deaf eares the care of the death of the ſoul, and the generall judgement, if we ſhould never*

* Aug. De Civit. Dei. 9. 10.
* *Hominum animos mortalibus vinculis eſſe à diis minoribus illigatos.*

* *Jupiter Pater laborantas animas miſeratus, earum vincula, quibus laborant, ſolubilia fabricavit.*
* *Plotinus Platonem præ cæteris intellexiſſe laudatur. Is, cùm de humanis animis ageret, Pater, inquit, miſericors mortalia illis vincula faciebat.*
* Barth. Sib. Peregrin. Quæſt. Decad. 1. c. 7. q. 2.

* *Ità hoc ipſum quòd mortales ſint homines corpore, ad miſericordiam Dei Patris pertinere arbitratus eſt, nè ſemper hujus vitæ miſeriâ teneantur.*

* Naz. Orat. 2. de Paſch.

* Rup. De Trinit. 3. 24. &c.

never have died, that are so proud to day, & dying to morrow? Well therefore did our Lord God strike Man with the death of the flesh & of the body, lest he should be ignorant of the death of his soul, and sleep securely in his pleasures till the dawning of the last day: that at least Man might be waked, even by the fear of the instantaneall death, and that he might not, like the immortall devil, adde prevarication to prevarication, but rather flee and avoid the pride & height of sinne by humble repentance. Let me adde, *Hence is the patience of the Saints. Here are the crowns of the Martyrs,* saith Chrysostome. This death causeth many vertues, which had else never been:* *O unclean World,* saith devout Bernard, *if thou holdest me so shortly passing, what shouldest thou do long remaining?* If ye desire more proofs, that death was appointed to Adam for sinne, and that he was kept from the tree of life, after he had sinned, lest his miserable life should have been immortall, consult with the authoritie of Irenæus, in his third book and 37. chap. of Hilarius, in his commentarie on Psal. 69.26: of Hierome, on Esai 65. of Cyrill of Alexandria, about the middle of his third book against Julian; and they shall confirm you in this point, That death is a bitter-sweet, a compound of judgement and mercy, a loathsom pill, and a punishment; yet wrapt up in gold, and working out health and blessings for mankinde.* *From the transgression two daughters are born, Sorrow and Death: which two daughters destroy their very ill mother.* Augustine against two Epistles of the Pelagians 4.4.* *Although by death much good be bestowed on good men (whereupon some have fitly discoursed even of the good of death) yet what hence can we commend but Gods mercie, that the punishment of sin is turned to good uses?* I will seal up all with the saying of Cicero in the beginning of his third book de Oratore, where he spake wiser then he was aware of,* *Life hath not been taken away from me by the immortall gods, but death hath been given.* Death is a benefit, though it was appointed unto Adam for sinne, for one sinne onely; which is the next point to be explained.

3. It is true, that the wages due to any one sinne is death; and as true, that we commit many sinnes; which are rightly divided into originall and actuall. Actuall sinnes are of a thousand kindes committed by us; yet none of these our sinnes, nor Adams after-sinnes, but his first sinne onely produced death. Likewise, originall sin consisteth of two parts; of Adams transgression, & of our corruption. In Adams transgression were many sinnes involved: & our corruption consisteth both in the want of original justice, & in the positive ill-qualitie of our nature. Adams sinne is imputed to us; our corruption, both inherent & imputed. His sin, as a qualitie, concerned himself; as relation, concerned us. As he was an individual man, it touched himself onely; as a cõmon person it drop't down upon us. His actuall sin is not propagated; his corrupting of our nature is deriv'd. And this corruption is both a sinne

* *O munde immunde, si sic me tenes breviter transeundo, quid faceres diu permanendo?*

* *A culpa natæ sunt duæ filiæ, Tristitia, & Mors; quæ duæ filiæ pessimam matrem destruunt.*

* *Quamvis bonis conferatur per mortem plurimum boni, (unde nonnulli etiam* DE BONO MORTIS *congruenter disputaverunt) tamen & hinc quæ prædicanda est nisi misericordia Dei, quòd in usus bonos convertitur pœna peccati?*

* *Mihi non à diis immortalibus vita erepta, sed mors donata est.*

a ſin and a puniſhment of ſinne. Some late Divines have written, *Originall ſinne is ſaid to be twofold. 1 Imputed, which was inherently in Adam, and charged upon his poſteritie. 2 Inherent, which is naturally propagated to us.* So, amongſt others, Scharpius pag. 463. But they ſpeak improperlie; for originall ſinne is but one onely, made up of two parts or branches; indeed, perchance, parts conſtituent, not *ratione* onely, but *re differentes*; yet not ſo natively to be call'd *a double ſinne*, as *one ſinne*, of two ſteps, degrees, ſections, compoſures, parts or branches: for originall ſinne is not many, not two, but one onely, *viz* for which death was inflicted. And this is the point I muſt now inſiſt upon, and thus I prove it apodictically.

Rom. 5. 12. *Death entred by ſinne*; and verſe 21, *Sinne reigned unto death*. Likewiſe, Rom. 6. 23, *The wages of ſinne is death*; and 1. Corint. 15. 56, *The ſting of death is ſinne*. All in the ſingular number, evincing it to be one onely ſinne. David complaineth Pſal. 51. 5, *I was ſhapen in iniquitie, and in ſinne did my mother conceive me*. In *ſinne*, not in *ſinnes*; both the Hebrew and the Vulgar Tranſlation have all theſe places in the ſingular number. Concerning David, it is obſervable, (leſt any one might imagine, that Davids mother was laſcivious, and that therefore he complained, and ſo this complaint concerned David himſelf onely and perſonally, and not us) that it was no part of Davids intent, to diſparage his mother; and Aquinas ſaith, *David was born of a lawfull wedlock: and we are ſure by a certaintie of faith, that the lawfull uſe of marriage is no ſinne.*

* *Certum eſt de fide, legitimum matrimonii uſum non eſſe peccatum* Aquin. Cont. Gent. lib. 4. cap. 5c.

To this let me ſuperadde Rom. 5. 18. Δι' ἑνὸς παραπτώματος, *Per unam offenſam*, as Montanus readeth it, and this expoſition is by our laſt Tranſlation admitted into the margine. But of this point more by and by.

Neither is it onely one, but it is all alike; not more in the evill, not leſſe in the good. Rom. 3. 9, *Are we better then the Gentiles? We have proved that Jews and Gentiles are all under ſinne, as it is written, There is none righteous, no not one.* Verſ. 19, *All the world is become guilty*, or, *ſubject to the judgement of God.* Again, *verſ. 22. There is no difference: for all have ſinned, and come ſhort of the glorie of God.* And before, he exactly deſcribeth the corruption of every man. Galat. 3. 22, *The Scripture hath concluded all under ſinne*. Auguſtine De Civitate Dei 16. 27, *If infants are born ſinners, not properly, but originally; certainly in the ſame manner that they are ſinners, they are acknowledged to be alſo tranſgreſſours of that law which was given in Paradiſe.* How could one infant tranſgreſſe the law in Paradiſe, more then an other? Geneſ. 17. 14, *He hath broken my covenant*. Which words you are to interpret of breaking the covenant in Adam, by originall ſinne, aſwell as of breaking the covenant of circumciſion. Auguſtine in the place above cited, when he had ſaid * *Since it is not the*

Si parvuli naſcuntur, non propriè, ſed originaliter, peccatores; profectò, eo modo quo ſunt peccatores, etiam prævaricatores legis illius, quæ in Paradiſo data eſt, agnoſcuntur.

fault

fault of the infant, whose soul God threatned to cut off; neither hath he broken Gods covenant, but his parents, who took no care to circumcise him (for such a childe *discerneth not his right hand from his left*, Jonas 4. 11, and such *little ones have no knowledge between good and evil*, Deuter. 1. 39.) then he resolveth thus, * *Infants, not in regard of their own life, but in respect of the common source of mankinde, have all broken Gods covenant in him in whom they have all sinned.* Again, * *In Adam he himself hath also sinned with all the rest.* My question here is, *Did not all children sinne alike in Paradise?* Aquinas answereth, *All are born equally sinners, all equally obnoxious to originall sinne; so that in them that die in originall sinne onely, there is no difference in fault or punishment answering unto it.* See Estius 2. Sentent. Distinct. 33. Sect. 5. and before him Lumbard, with his army of Schoolmen.

Three places there are most fully demonstrative, both that it was one offence onely, and that this offence was of one person onely. Rom. 5. 15. *By the sinne*, the single singular sinne, *of one* (for none of it is in the plurall number) *many are dead.* Death crept not in by more sinnes, or by more sinners, but for one onely offence of one person onely. It is not τῷ ἑνὶ παραπτώματι but τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι, *per peccatum unius.* He might have said as easilie (if he could have said it as truly) *by the sinne of two*, if by Eves sin properly we had died. This is also excellently seconded in the next verse, Rom. 5. 16. *And not as it was by* ONE *that sinned*, Δι' ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος (there is the singularitie of the person) *so is the gift: for the judgement was of* ONE *to condemnation* (which you must not interpret of *one* Adam, or *one* Person, but of *one* sinne, if you make the antithesis to have marrow and sinnews; and so the Old Bishops Bible reades it) *but the free gift is* ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων, *of many offences unto justification.* So to the singularitie of one person, you see annexed the singularitie of one offence. The same truth is confirmed and reiterated, Rom. 5. 17, 18, 19: every verse proving it was but *one* person, and *one* sinne.

The Fathers joyn issue with us. Chrysostom Homil. on 1. Corinth. 9, *Adam by one sinne did draw in death.* And again, *He by one onely sinne brought so much evil and death.* For if Adam had not sinned; as he had not propagated his personall gifts, graces, acquisite vertues, nor experimentall knowledge; so after his first sinne, which is derived to us, his other sinnes were meerly personall, and one onely is become naturall to all of us: all his other sinnes were bound up in the sole reference unto himself, none imputed or derived to his posteritie. And therefore originall sinne hath no degrees, *nec suscipit magis aut minus*; or hath more branches or parts in any childe of Adam, then in others; but equally and alike extendeth unto all; none free, none more infected then others, as I proved before.

Paulinus calleth it * *The fatherly poison, by which the father having*

* *Cùm hæc nulla sit culpa parvuli, cujus dixit animam perituram; nec ipse dissipaverat Testamentum Dei, sed majores, qui eum circumcidere non curárunt.*

* *Parvuli, non secundum vitæ suæ proprietatem, sed secundum communem generis humani originem, omnes in illo uno Testamentum Dei dissipaverunt, in quo omnes peccaverunt.*

* *In Adam, cum omnibus, etiam ipse peccavit.* Aquin. 1. 2. q. 82. art. 4.

τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον.

having tranſgreſſed hath infected his whole kinde. Others ſtile it *The venime of the loyns.* Chryſoſtom, on 1. Corinth. 9. termeth it *The radicall ſinne.* Auguſtine ſaith, * *There is one ſinne in which all have ſinned, and therefore all men are ſaid to have ſinned in one Adam, and by one ſinne of Adam, becauſe all were that one man.* Item, * *That one ſinne which is ſo great, and was committed in a place and condition of ſo great happines, that in one man originally, and, that I may ſay, raditally all mankinde ſhould be damned, is not done away but by Chriſt.* And often he beates on this point, that it was one ſinne which overthrew us. * *One, none but one tranſgreſſion the Apoſtle will have to be underſtood*, ſaith he againſt Julian. And again, * *Infants die guiltie onely of originall ſinne, men of yeares guiltie of all ſins which by a wicked life they have added to that one.* Ignatius calleth it *The ancient impietie.* Irenæus ſtileth it *The hand-writing written by Adam.* All in the ſingular number pointing at one man onely, and at one ſinne onely.

Two points are cleared:

We are appointed to die { for *one* ſinne onely, / of *one* perſon onely.

It followeth by the native and genuine method; This perſon was *one* man; This *one* man was Adam: And ſo by conſequent it was not Eves ſinne for which death was appointed to us. And firſt of the firſt part.

4. That this perſon ſinning was *one* man, ſeemeth evidenced, Rom. 5. 16, Δι' ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος. *By one that ſinned.* It is not ſaid Διὰ μιᾶς ἁμαρτησούσης. Yet if that proof reach not home, but may ſuffer extenſion, even to Angels or ſpirits; others ſhall. 1. Cor. 15. 21. Δι' ἀνθρώπου ὁ θάνατος. *By man came death, and by man the Reſurrection of the dead.* You may as well deny the Reſurrection by the Sonne of man, as that ſinne or death came not by man. Again, Rom. 5. 12. Δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου, *By one man ſinne entred into the World, and death by ſinne*: the word ἀνθρώπου demonſtrating the humane nature; and ἑνὸς joyned with it, neceſſarily pointing and ſigning out the maſculine, and not the feminine. Rom. 5. 19, διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου, *By the diſobedience of one man*; where moſt evidently, not onely the humane nature is ſigned, and marked out unto us, but alſo the maſculine ſex; the *He*, and not the *She*.

Having found that he was a Man, for whoſe ſinne death was appointed, let us now follow the ſent, and we ſhall trace out who he was; which is the main point of inquirie.

Searching the Scriptures, even cloſe to the former place occurreth this, 1. Corint. 15. 22, *As in Adam all die, even ſo in Chriſt ſhall all be made alive.* He who confeſſeth the quickning power of the ſecond Adam unto Reſurrection, muſt alſo confeſſe the weaknes of the firſt Adam, and that *In him all men die.* Indeed it is ſaid, Eccl. 25. 24. Ἀπὸ γυναικὸς ἀρχὴ ἁμαρτίας καὶ δι' αὐτὴν ἀποθνήσκομεν; δι' αὐτὴν

* *Virus paternum quo univerſitatem generis ſui pater prævaricatus infecit.* Apud Auguſt. Epiſt. 105.
* *Eſſe unum peccatum, in quo omnes peccaverunt, & ideò dici omnes homines in uno Adamo, & uno Adæ peccato peccâſſe, quia omnes ille unus homo fuerant.* De Peccat. Merit. & Rem. l. 1. 10.
* *Illud unum peccatum, quod tam magnum, in loco & habitu tantæ felicitatis admiſſum eſt; ut in uno homine originaliter, atque, ut ità dixerim, radicaliter totum genus hominum damnaretur, non ſolvitur niſi per Chriſtum.* Enchirid. cap. 48.
* *Unum, non viſi unum, delictum intelligi vult Apoſtolus.* Cont. Julian. 1. 6.
* *Parvuli moriuntur ſoli peccato originali obnoxii; adulti omnibus peccatis quæ malè vivendo addiderunt ad illud unum.* Enchir. cap. 43.
* Ignatius. Epiſt. ad Trallianos.
* Iren. lib. 5.

ἀνὴρ in the Accusative, *Of the woman came the beginning of sin, and through her we all die.* But of Adam the phrase is used in the Genitive, Rom. 5, three severall times, *Per illam, non in illa morimur.* The Divines distinguish them two: We die by her, and in Adam; We also die by the Devill, as he was the tempter of her, as well as by her, she being the tempter of Adam; by them both occasionally, by him and onely in him effectually. So for the former part of the words, it is true, * *Eve began sinne, but Adam made it compleat.* She was *principium*, but *principium principiatum:* Satan was the *principium principians, the mover primo-primus. He was a murderer from the beginning.* John 8. 44. ἐκεῖνος ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς: not from the first absolute beginning, for then Satan had no being: not from his own beginning; for at his creation he was good, as all things els were: but so soon as ever man was, he resolved to destroy man, and with reference to that intention he was a man-slayer or a murderer of man from the beginning of man. From Satan was the beginning of sin, from Eve a seconding, a middesse, a continuation; you may call it *an other beginning, secundo-primum.* But had not Adam sinned, death had not reigned: for *in Adam all die*; it was never said of Eve, *in Eve we die.*

* *Ab Eva initium peccati, ab Adamo complementum.*

Augustine saith, * *God made some certain creatures solitarias, & quodam modo solivagas, solitarie, and after a sort wandring alone, as eagles, kites, lions, wolves; other creatures gregales, that love to troupe, fly, shoal, and herd together; as pigeons, stares, fishes, deere; and made divers of them, all at once, of severall kindes, and not onely two of each kinde, by which the rest should be propagated; but he made the man unum & singulum, one and single, and would not create the woman when he created the man; but made her of man himself,* * *that all mankinde should be derived from one man.* He annexeth other where, *That originall sinne might come from one onely man.*

* Aug. De Civit. 12. 21.

* *Vt omnes ex homine uno diffunderetur genus humanum.*

The Apostle saith most divinely, 1. Timoth. 2. 14, *Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.* From whence though the ignorant may think, that Eve was the sinner, and Adam was not; yet they erre, not understanding the Apostle. His main intent is to prove, that *a woman ought to be silent and subject, and not usurp authoritie over the man*, as a talking woman doth; and this he effecteth by two reasons. First, *Adam was first formed, then Eve.* The reason holds of things of the same species. Otherwise, beasts and birds were created before Adam. Secondly, *Adam was not deceived, but Eve*: not first deceived, not deceived by a beast, and one of the worst of them, a serpent. Therefore she is unfit to be any longer a teacher. Chrysostom thus, *The woman taught once, and marred all; therefore let her teach no longer.* Hence it appeareth it was no part of the Apostles meaning, to handle, Whether the sinne of Adam or of Eve caused mankinde to fall (which is our main point) for the transgression here mentioned was not that sinne, that great sin,

but παράβασις, *diverticulum tranſiens, a peccadillo*, a little ſinne, in reſpect of that great ἀνομία and ἁμαρτία, which ingaged all mankinde: much leſſe did the Apoſtle intend to excuſe Adam from that great preſumptuous offence, in which he onely was. That ſin of his being called παρακοὴ, Rom. 5.19: which muſt needs be a crying ſin, and almoſt infinite; ſince it is oppoſed to Chriſts obedience, called there ὑπακοή. Adam was not deceived; becauſe no man is properly deceived, but of him who hath an intent to deceive: now the Devil onely had ſuch an intent, and thereupon deceived Eve. Wherefore ſhe complaineth ſaying, *the Serpent beguiled me*, Geneſ. 3.13, & the Apoſtle ratifieth it, 2. Corinth. 11. 3. *The Serpent beguiled Eve through his ſubtilty*. And in this manner Eve onely *being deceived was in the tranſgreſsion*. For Satan ſet not upon Adam. **The Devil ſet not upon him that had received in preſence the heavenly commandment, but upon her that had learned it of her huſband*, ſaith Ambroſe; Yea S. Auguſtine opineth* *That by that ſerpentine craft, by which the woman was ſeduced, Adam could not have been ſeduced*. Tertullian ſpeaketh thus to womankinde; **Thou art the Devils doore, thou art ſhe that haſt invaded him whom the Devil could not ſet upon*. If he could not ſet upon him, much leſſe could he have overcom him. Hierom ſaith, **the Apoſtle doth prove that the Devil could not ſeduce Adam, but Eve*. But then comes Eve in her ſimplicitie, intending no hurt or deceit to her huſband, & upon three other grounds ſpecialized Geneſ. 3.6. Firſt, *ſhe ſaw that the tree was good for food*. Secondly, *it was pleaſant to the eyes*. Thirdly, *a tree to be deſired to make one wiſe*. She (I ſay) upon theſe three motives did both eat and give Adam to eat. So Adam was not deceived, either firſt or immediately, by the Serpent or ſerpentine deceit, as Eve was: neither doth Adam complain, that the Serpent or Eve beguiled him; but when he derived the fault from himſelf, the worſt that he ſaid of Eve was this, Geneſ. 3.12, *The woman whom thou gaveſt to be with me, ſhe gave me of the tree*. Neither doth the Scripture any where impute a malicious, envious, or guilefull intent to Eve, in drawing Adam into the tranſgreſſion. Nor doth the Apoſtle ſay abſolutely, *Adam was not in the tranſgreſsion*; but, *Adam was not deceiv'd*, or brought into the tranſgreſſion by fraud. For the word Ἀπατᾶσθαι ſignifieth to be deceived by art and craft: ſo the Devill perſwaded Eve, *That God of envy unto man forbad him that tree*, ſaith * Auguſtine; and perhaps told her it was no ſin for her to eat, becauſe ſhe received no immediate commandement; whereas Adam knew it was a ſinne, but therefore might think it eaſilie pardonable, *becauſe he had formerly known no experience of Gods ſeveritie*, ſaith the ſame* Auguſtine. And yet for all this Adam might be in a tranſgreſsion, in the tranſgreſsion, and the greateſt tranſgreſſion, though not in that tranſgreſsion of being ſeduc'd. And for his tranſgreſsion death is appointed for us.

*Diabolus non eſt adorſus eum qui corâm acceperat cæleſte mandatum, ſed eam quæ à viro didicerat. Ambr. lib. de Paradiſo cap. 12. *Dolo illo ſerpentino*, &c Aug. De Gen. ad lit. 11. 42.

*Tu es Diaboli janua, tu es quæ cum invaſiſti quem Diabolus aggredi non valuit. Tert. lib. De Habitu muliebri.

*Probat quòd Diabolus non poterat ſeducere Adam, ſed Evam. Hiero. lib. 1. adverſus Joviniaanum, circa medium.

*Aug. De Gen. ad lit. 11. 30.

*Aug. De Civit. 14. 11.

For

For in Adam all die. Abel was the firſt who died the bodily death; yet Abel died in Adam: and if for Adams ſinne death had not been appointed to him firſt, Abel had not died yet, ſince *Morte morieris* was ſpoken to Adam alone, before Eve was created: and it may be it implieth, that upon his ſinne all that any way came of him, either by avulſion of ſome part, as Eve did, or by propagation, ſhould die in him. And ſo though Eve had eaten, if Adam had not ſinned, neither Adam, nor perhaps Eve herſelf had died. And if Adam had eaten and Eve forborn, yet perhaps Eve ſhould have died: for Eve was in Adam as well as we, 1. Corinth. 11. 8. *The man was not of the woman, but the woman of the man.* And in him was ſhe to ſtand or fall, live or die, as well as we. *In Adam all die,* and ſhe among the reſt, ſince ſhe was one, and a part of that all. If my above mentioned ſpeculations require further proof, conſider Rom. 5. 14, *Death reigned from Adam*; where he is expreſly mentioned, as being, in my interpretation, the *Idea* of mankinde, and we being in him *tanquam in principio activo.* Satan ſinned againſt God in tempting the woman, the woman ſinned againſt God in eating and offering the fruit unto the man. If thou, O Adam, hadſt not conſented, neither of theſe ſinnes had hurt thee or mankinde. * *Adam was we all.* Give me leave to ſay ſo, ſince S. Auguſtine ſaith, * *We all were that one Adam.* Nor did God firſt challenge Eve, but Adam; nor her ſo punctually as he did Adam, Geneſ. 3. 9. And verſ. 22, it is not ſaid of Eve, but of Adam, ironically, *Adam is become like one of us*: for he was the root of mankinde, Eve was but a branch of Adam before or when ſhe ſinned, and no root of mankinde actuall, but potentiall; for ſhe ſinned when ſhe was a virgin. Juſtin Martyr in his dialogue with Triphon thus, *Eve being an intemerated virgin, and conceiving by the Serpent, brought forth diſobedience, and by conſequent, death.* Theodoret on thoſe words of the Pſalmiſt, Pſal. 51. 1. &c. *The tranſgreſſion of the commandment went before Eves conception: for after the tranſgreſſion, and the divine ſentence, and the privation of Paradiſe Adam knew Eve his wife; and ſhe having conceived brought forth Cain.* Had Adam carnally known Eve before he ſinned, yea after herſelf ſinned, ſhe had conceived, and then the iſſue had had no originall ſin: yea, he is no worſe Divine then Aquinas, who holdeth that *at this inſtant if one by miracle were created an humane creature, body & ſoul, he ſhould not have originall ſin.* * *And if Adam had ſinned, & not Eve, we had fallen into originall ſin; and if ſhe had eaten, and not he, we had not been ſtain'd with originall ſinne.* Scharpius ſaith, * *The cauſe of originall ſinne was Adam, not Eve; and Adams ſinne, not Eves, doth paſſe to the poſteritie.* Tertullian proveth that Eve was nevertheleſſe a virgin, becauſe being in Paradiſe ſhe was called a woman. * *A woman,* ſaith he, *pertains to the ſex it ſelf, not to the degree of the ſex.* One may be

* *Adam erat nos omnes.*
* *Omnes eramus ille unus Adam.* De peccat. Merit. & Remiſ. 1. 10.

1. 2. Quæſt. 18. Art. 4.
* Art. ſequenti.

call'd a woman, though not a wife; but a *non-mulier*, a no-woman can not either be or be call'd a wife. I adde, ſhe was a wife, & ſo called, Geneſ. 2.25: and yet, till after Adam ſinned, ſhe was a virgin, eſpouſed, married, yet not known carnally. She was termed *Iſha*, or *Iſſa*, *Virago*, before the fall, Geneſ. 2.23: becauſe ſhe was taken out of *Iſh*, or *Is*, *out of man*. She was alſo ſtiled *The female*, and *wife*; but ſhe was never called *Eve*, during her creation and innocency, or in the *interim* between her fall and Adams. But after Adams ſin he firſt called his wives name *Eve*, Geneſ. 3.20, *becauſe ſhe was the mother of all living*. Not as if any did then live as from her, or were born of her, when Adam ſo called her; but the great Calculator of natures, the ὀνοματυργὸς, the Onomaſtick, or exact and true Nomenclator of all things brought before him, thought fit to name her *Eve*, that is, *The mother of all living*; not before, but after his fall, becauſe, in my opinion, ſhe had not been *Mater viventium*, if ſhe alone had ſinned. Her ſinne might have had other puniſhment, her perſonall fault had ended in her perſonall chaſtiſement. Eve was created in Paradiſe; and, for all her ſin, we had continued ſtill in Paradiſe, if Adam had kept in it: but as Adam was made out of Paradiſe, ſo out of it again by his fall he brought both himſelf & us. S. Ambroſe ſaith, * *Adam was, & in him we were all; he periſhed, & in him all periſhed.* Eve was onely a part of Adam, till his fall; he being till then the onely root: after his ſinne ſhe is now alſo *Eva, mater viventium*, a root, yet *radix de radice*: we receive our ſap, & bring forth fruit through both of them. And for all this, both Scripture and Fathers runne with a torrent, aſcribing that great ſin, which plunged mankinde into deſtruction, not unto Eve, ſave onely as the occaſioner, but unto Adam, as the immediate cauſer. And though Eve ſinned before Adam, and that in divers reſpects; yet is he chiefly, yea onely faultie, for preſenting vs, by his fall, to deſtruction. Hoſea 6.7. *They like Adam have tranſgreſſed the covenant there*; or (as the Vulgar hath it, joyning *Ibi* to the latter clauſe) *Ibi prævaricati ſunt in me. Ibi*, ſaith Hierom, *that is, in Paradiſe.* And Adam is excellently painted out, Eſai 43.27, *Thy firſt father hath ſinned.* Eve is not mentioned; for her ſinne, conſidered by itſelf, reached not to them, nor hurt any but herſelf *per ſe*, and us *per accidens*, as Adam yeelded to her temptation. When God had denounced ſeverall puniſhments, firſt to Eve, then to Adam, and proper to each by themſelves, he added this to Adam onely, *Duſt thou art, and unto duſt ſhalt thou return.* For even in him, and by him was Eve to return to duſt, and by his offence formally *Death cometh on all.* And therefore not from Eve, but from Adam doth S. Luke draw our pedegree, Luke.3.38, *Which was the ſonne of Adam, which was the ſonne of God.* And therefore as the Genealogies were ever drawn from the males (perchance to ſhew that the woman was but accidental

* *Mulier ad ſexum ipſum, non ad gradum ſexûs pertinet.* Tertull. lib. De velandis Virginibus.

* *Fuit Adam, & in illo fuimus omnes; periit Adam, & in eo perierunt omnes.* Ambr. in Lucam lib. 7.

accidentall to our first making, and the first sinne reducing all up to the Protoplast Adam, who derived originall sinne both to Eve and all us, though in different manner) so when they had drawn their Genealogies down to Christ, who had no man to be his father, nor had originall sinne, but satisfied for it & all other sinnes, all Genealogies are ceased, yea counted by the Apostle as *foolish and vain*, Titus 3.9. Against one of these passages if it be objected, that Joab is not termed after his father, but full often, yea alwayes after his mother, *The sonne of Zeruiah*, for she was the sister of David, 1. Chron. 2. 16: I answer, that Zeruiah the mother of the three famous brethren, Joab, Abishai, Asahel was, perhaps, married to some base ignoble groom before David came to his greatnes: or she herself was an extraordinary *Virago*, active in State, plotting and furthering the plots of her children, though she crost her brother David; and therefore (as I take it) she is named, not so much in honour as in dislike, *These men the sonnes of Zeruiah be too hard for me*, 2. Sam. 3.39: Or lastly, the father of Joab had committed such a sinne or sinnes, that the remembrance of him was odious, and might resemble Judas Iscariot, who deserved that *in the next generation his name should be blotted out*, Psal. 109. 13.

When Adam transgressed my statutes, 2. Esdras 7. 11, 12. — *then were the entrances of this world made narrow, full of sorrow and travel.* And in reference, it may be, to Adams especiall sinning both a man-childe was born before a woman-childe, and a man-childe died before a woman-childe, & the males onely were circumcised, and Adam himself died ten yeares before Eve, as Salianus, out of Marianus Scotus, Genebrard, & Fevardentius, collecteth; though never a woman els, except Eve, from the creation til the Law of Moses is recorded to have outlived their good husbands. As for Er & Onan, they were wicked, & for their sin cut off shortly, Genes. 38. 7, &c. Sure I am, he had an especiall manner of transgression, since some are punished who *have not sinned after the similitude of Adams transgression*, Rom. 5. 14. Other sinnes we sinned, & are like to Adam: but herein we are unlike. His sinne hurt us aswell as himself: our sinnes hurt not him, but ourselves. Bellarmin hath brought unto my hand the thre following authorities: Tertullian, * *Every soul is counted in Adam, untill it be reckoned in Christ.* Hierom, * *Every one of us fell in Paradise with Adam.* Cyprian derives the infants sin from Adam onely. For we were in him *tanquã in activo principio.* In him, to stand or fall. *Adam is the figure of him that was to come*, Rom. 5. 14. Was Eve a type of Christ? was Christ ever resembled or compared or contra-opposed unto Eve? The Apostle, Rom. 5. 15, 16, sheweth wherein Adam was like and unlike to Chirst (of which hereafter.) And most divinely to our purpose, verse 17, &c. *If by one mans offence, death reigned by one, much more the righteous*

* *Omnis anima eousq; in Adam censetur, donec in Christo recensea-tur.* Tert. lib. *De Anima.*

* *Vnusquisq; nostrûm in Paradiso cum Adamo cecidit.* Hieron in Mich. 2.

* Cypr. lib. 3. Epist. 8. Ad Fidum.

ſhall reigne by one Ieſus Chriſt. No inkling, no intimation of more ſinnes then of one; of more perſons firſt ſinning that one ſinne, then of one; and that one was not Eve, but Adam: therefore as Chriſts Merits onely ſave us, ſo Adams ſinne onely did deſtroy us. Cherubim faceth Cherubim, Type and Antitype muſt agree. When the Apoſtle ſaith of Adam, ὃς ἐστι τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος, *illius futuri* (as the Interlinearie reades it) not ἣν, but ὃς; not *quæ*, but *qui*, proveth the excluſion of Eve. But of the firſt man Adam and the laſt Adam, is a noted ſweet reſemblance, 1. Corinth. 15. 45. Where he holdeth it not enough to ſay, *The firſt Adam*, but leſt Eve might ſeem to be included in the compariſon, he addeth, *The firſt man Adam*; and ſo compareth him to Chriſt. Likewiſe verſe 47, *The firſt man is of the earth earthy: the ſecond man is the Lord from heaven*. Yet was not Chriſt the ſecond man in number, but in repreſentation of mankinde, being the ſubſtance of the firſt ſhadow. Adam was the firſt, the onely one who hurt us; Chriſt is the ſecond man, the onely one who helpeth us. Yea, I think I may be bold to averre, that Chriſt would have taken on him the feminine ſex, if by Eve we had fallen: but ſince we fell by man, by man onely; therefore our Redeemer, though he came of a woman, yet was made a man. And Chriſt having determined to be, not a woman, but a man, I dare further avouch, if he had been *a ſtone cut out*, not* *a ſtone cut out without hands*, Daniel 2. 34, without the help of man, as he was: if he had not been conceived by the Holy Ghoſt; if the Bleſſed Virgin had not been over-ſhadowed by the power of God onely: if Chriſt had been begotten by one of the ſonnes of Adam, with an ordinarie and naturall generation; even Chriſt himſelf had had both originall and actuall ſinne, and had died for himſelf by and through Adam, and had wanted a Redeemer for himſelf; much leſſe could he be our Redeemer. But Chriſt was that Stone. *This Stone which the builders refuſed, is become the head-ſtone of the corner*, Pſal. 118. 22: *A tried ſtone, a precious corner-ſtone, a ſure foundation*, Eſai. 28. 16. Let me adde a little: Since Adam was made without the help of man or woman, and Eve came of man without woman: ſince all the whole world of rationall people proceed from both man and woman; it was convenient enough, that there ſhould be a miraculous and fourth kinde of generation, different from all the reſt; namely, that Chriſt ſhould come of a woman alone, without the aſsiſtance of man, that he might be free from originall ſinne, which was firſt committed by Adam and his maſculine brood, and not without his ſeed and the *artifex ſpiritus* in it.

In which regard (without derogation to the thrice-bleſſed Mother of our Lord, that holy-æviternally Virgin Mary, now, next to her Sonne, the greateſt Saint in heaven, and placed deſervedly above Angels and Archangels, Cherubims and Seraphims)

* *Et abſciſſus eſt lapis Dominus, & Salvator, ſine manibus; id eſt, abſque coitu & humano ſemine, de utero virginali.* Heron. in Dan. 2. 34 *Quid eſt Præciſus de monte, ſine manibus? Natus de Gente Judæorum, ſine opere hominum. Omnes enim qui naſcuntur, de opere maritali naſcuntur: ille de Virgine natus, ſine manibus natus eſt: per manus enim opus humanum ſignificatur, quòd manus humanæ non acceſſerunt; ubi maritalis amplexus non fuit, fœtus tamen fuit.* Aug. in Pſal. 99. 5. ipſi, 70 ſecuto, 98, ſub finem.

raphims) great Divines do make this difference; She, who was not begotten but by man, was ſubject to originall ſinne; but her ſonne, *the Sonne of God*, was free, even in his humane Nature, from all infection, originall and actuall, becauſe in his framing there was no admiſture of virile and maſculine cooperation. For the poiſoning of our nature aroſe from Adams ſinne, and not from Eves. Moreover, if by miracle God ſhould preſerve a man from any touch or tickling ſmach of luſtfull ſinne in the act of generation, the fathers perſonall holines ſhould not diſcharge his childe from originall mire: for the traducted nature is corrupt.* Bellarmine goes one ſtep further, thus, *If both man and woman, the children of Adam, by Gods ſingular priviledge were exempted from luſt, in the generation of their children; yet ſhould they tranſmit ſinne to their offſpring.* For though S. Auguſtine ſaith expreſly,* that *it is not the generation, but the luſt, which properly tranſmits ſinne:* yet S. Auguſtine may be interpreted to ſpeak of generations meerly uſuall and wholy naturall, not priviledged or extraordinarie. Curſed therefore are the Pelagians, who ſay, *Sinne and death entred by Eve.* Sinne perſonall did, but not originall, nor death. Groſſe is the ignorance of the Pelagians, who when the Apoſtle ſaith Δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου, think to delude it with this ſilly ſhift, that ἄνθρωπος ſignifieth either man or woman; and ſay it is not Δι' ἀνδρὸς, which muſt needs have been underſtood of Adam onely. I anſwer, Δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου is fully equivalent to Δι' ἀνδρὸς, ſince ἑνὸς is not, and can not be underſtood of the feminine. Secondly, the Apoſtle maketh the Antitheſis between that ἀνθρώπου and Chriſt, which can not be between Eve and Chriſt. Thirdly, a little after the Apoſtle twice expreſſeth Adam, but never nameth or meaneth Eve. Laſtly, it is ſaid remarkably concerning Abraham, Hebr. 11. 12, *There ſprang even of one, and him as good as dead, many.* And more approaching to our purpoſe, Act. 17. 26, *God made all mankinde* ἐξ ἑνὸς αἵματος, *of one bloud*, with apparent reference to Adam onely. Therefore as the naturall generation is aſcribed to Adam and Abraham onely, though Eve and Sara in their ſort concurre to the materiall part of the embryon, becauſe the Men do conferre the formall: ſo the degenerating unto vice is juſtly imputed to Adam onely, though Eve did miniſter the occaſion; becauſe his conſent and action onely could give form and ſhape to that prodigious ſinne which overthrew mankinde.

Bell. *De Amiſſ. gratiæ & Statu peccati.* 4. 12.

*Non generationem, ſed libidinem eſſe, quæ propriè peccatum traducit. De peccat. Merit. & Remiſ. 1. 9.

5. From this point more queſtions may yet ariſe. Firſt, If Adam & Eve had not ſinned, but Cain or ſome other of their children, whether that ſinne had been derived to their poſteritie? * Aquinas is for the affirmative, others for the negative: *Becauſe the firſt man onely repreſented our whole nature, all other mens ſinnes are particular and perſonall, & can not infect others.* Thus farre Scharpius.

*Aquin. quæſt. 5. *De Malo* art. 4.

I make a ſecond Queſtion. If Adam and Eve had continued

in innocencie, and had been confirmed in grace, whether any of their children could have ſinned?

Auguſtine embraceth the affirmative of this Queſtion, ſaying, * *As happie as Adam and Eve were,—ſo happie had been the whole companie of mankinde, if they, nor no ſtirp of them committed ſinne which ſhould receive damnation.* The ſame* elſewhere, *The children which ſhould have been begotten of innocent Adam and Eve,* * *had been led to the ſame ſtate, if they all had lived juſtly and obediently.** Eſtius ſeconds him, alledging theſe reaſons: Firſt, *Adam and Eve had not begotten children in better condition then themſelves were created of God; therefore they ſhould have begot juſt children, but not confirmed in juſtice.* Secondly, *Angels were not ordained to bleſſednes, but by the merit of their free-will to good or evill; and we are to think the like of men:* * *They were not to be ſettled in the end, till they had finiſhed the courſe of this way, which is the time of meriting.* Thirdly, Hugo and Lumbard ſay, *God propounded to Adam and Eve inviſible goods and eternall, to be ſought by their merits, and ordained that by merit they might come to reward.* Aquinas * determineth, *That children born in the ſtate of innocencie, had not been confirmed in juſtice:* yae, * *it ſeems not poſsible, that in the ſtate of innocencie children ſhould be born confirmed in juſtice.* So Aquine, and Gregorie de Valentia on him.

A ſecond way is taken by * Abulenſis, and followed by * Catharinus, viz. That if Adam had not ſinned, his poſteritie ſhould have been confirmed in originall juſtice, but not *in gratia gratum faciente, in ſaving grace.* Where they do very ill, to ſet ſuch inward friends ſo much at odds; for originall juſtice and *gratia gratum faciens* differ onely *ratione*, not *re*; and none could have one, that had not both, they being in the ſtate of innocencie glued inſeparably: but they had been born *in gratia gratum faciente*, ſaith * Aquine. Therefore do I conclude, both with Aquine againſt them, that the poſteritie of innocent Adam had been born *in gratia gratum faciente*; and with them againſt Aquine, that they had been confirmed in originall juſtice.

Scotus ſeeing the inconveniences of Aquin's poſition, takes a third way, namely, That the poſterity of juſt Adam ſhould have been born both in juſtice and grace, but not confirmed till they had overcome their firſt temptation. Before I come to grapple with Scotus, I muſt firſt trie my ſtrength againſt Aquinas; from whoſe poſition theſe three conſequences do neceſſarily flow, as * Eſtius his great diſciple confeſſeth. Firſt, that ſome of Adams children might have continued obedient, others might have been diſobedient to God. Secondly, That the juſt children of innocent Adam ſhould have been tempted by Satan, not *once* onely, but often. Thirdly, That without temptation they might have ſinned, by their own will onely. Againſt the

*Aug. De Civit. l. 4. c. 10.

*De Gen. ad lit. l. 9. c. 3.

*Ad eundem perducerentur ſtatum, ſi omnes juſtè obedienterque vixiſſent.

*Eſt. in 2. Sent. diſt. 20. paragr. 5.

*Non prius erant in termino conſtituendi, quàm viæ hujus curriculum, quod eſt tempus merendi, peregiſſent.

*Aquin. part. 1. quæſt. 100. art. 2.

*Non videtur poſſibile, quòd pueri in ſtatu innocentiæ naſcerentur in juſtitia confirmati.

*Abul. in Gen. 3. quæſt. 6. & 7.

*Cath. in locum.

*Aquin. part. 1. quæſt. 100. art. 1. ad. 2.

*Eſt. in 2. Sent. diſt. 20. Parag. 5.

the first consequence I thus argue. *If some of innocent Adams children had sinned, should they have had any children or none?* Not none; for the blessing of *Crescite & Multiplicamini* reached to all. Should their children then naturally have been good or bad? Not good and innocent; for that is not the issue of actually disobedient offenders. If they had been born wicked, then had their generations so been, and the generations from them to the Worlds end: and millions of souls had perished, which fell not in Adam, but in and by their other parents; which crosseth the main current of Divinitie. For Adam onely represented all mankinde, and in him onely were we to stand or fall. Adam in Paradise, even before his sinne, was a Type of Christ, (compare Genes. 2. 24. with Ephes. 5. 30, &c.) and stood *idealiter* for us all. See Rom. 5. 12, &c. He was τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος. *Adam erat nos omnes, & nos omnes eramus ille unus Adam.* By Aquins consequence more first Adams are set up, by which mankinde might have fallen; and so more second Adams to restore them. But by one man came death, and by the bloud of onely one are we redeemed. Again, if innocent Adams just children, though unconfirm'd, had begot just unconfirmed children, & yet afterthat generation these unconfirm'd fathers had sinned; what children should they have begot after their sinne? should the same father have brought forth life and death? good children and bad? and seen some of his children happie, and himself and other children miserable? And suppose the mothers had sinned, and not the fathers; should the mothers have been in the stead of the first Adam? should the children have fallen in them, or no? A third absurditie followeth from Aquins position, namely, That the righteous should have begotten not one constantly righteous, from the beginning to the Worlds end: but everie one that had sinned, should have begotten sinfull children for ever. And so, for one that had continued righteous and been translated, millions might have been sinners, and died. Lastly, no one man had been certain of his salvation any time of his life, though he had lived never so long, and never so justly; which yet, even *in statu lapso*, hath been granted to some few.

Against the second consequence from Aquins doctrine, viz. *That even the just children of innocent Adam should have been tempted by Satan, not once, but often*, I oppose these demands: How many times are included in the word *often?* or when should there have been an end of tempting? If at any set time of their life; why at that time, and never before nor after? If they should have been tempted all the dayes of their life, the felicitie of Eden might have been more troubled, and fluid then the waters of it; and I might justly say, *O poore Paradise, unsetled integritie, provoked or tempted innocence, tremulous estate; where Satan the stronger had power alwaies to tempt, and malice enough*

enough to charge home with cunning, and man the weaker had power alwaies to fall.

The third conſequence is ſomewhat queſtionable, as inferring, that all and every of Mankinde, even without any temptation, might have ſinned by their own will onely; making the happines of Paradiſe worſe then our preſent unhappines, where man ſinneth not but, being tempted either by Satan, or his own concupiſcence, Jam. 1. 14. For all the evill thoughts of our will are truly divided into* *injected and aſcending*; and none of the *aſcending* have been in the will before they were in the underſtanding, and nothing hath been in the underſtanding that hath not been in the ſenſes. Beſides, death was to be inflicted, not for the ſinne of the will onely, or meerly, but for the eating of the forbidden fruit.

Immiſſas & aſcendentes.

Theſe or the like, or worſe inconveniences, perhaps, made Scotus to varie from Aquine, and more probably to defend, That upon triumph over their firſt temptation, every one of the children of innocent Adam had been confirmed in grace. *We may not yeeld this*, ſaith Eſtius. *And it is not true, and there is no reaſon for it, and it little agreeth with the commination*, In the day that thou eateſt thereof, thou ſhalt ſurely die, Geneſ. 2. 17, ſaith Gregorie de Valentia. I anſwer, That the words *In the day* may prove, that they might not have been tempted the firſt or ſecond day, or in a ſhort time; but they hinder not, but upon overcoming of their firſt temptation, they might every day after have been confirmed. Again, the commination was not ſpoken to Adam, as an individuall perſon, but to him as the Feoffee of mankinde. If every one ſhould have ſtood for himſelf and his poſteritie, what is Adams ſinne more to me then Cains, or my laſt and immediate fathers firſt actuall ſinne, if neither Adam, nor any of his children had ſinned before mine own father? But ſince we did fall, not perſonally in our ſelves, not in our immediate parents, not in any but Adam, by the breach of that commination: ſo on the contrarie, not by any other parents obedience, not by our own obedience, but by the obedience of that one man unto that one commination, we ſhould have ſtood, yea have been confirmed. Thus have you mine opinion againſt Scotus, much more againſt Aquinas: and this is my reaſon. Naturally, by the bleſſing of ordinarie generation, every creature was to beget its like according to kinde: the branch was to partake of the vertue and nature of the root; and ſo, without Adams repreſenting us, he ſhould have begot us in ſuch an eſtate as he himſelf was, with a libertie to good and evill, with a power to fall or not fall. But as Gods infinite wiſdome choſe him out, with expreſſe or tacit compact, that if he ſtood, all his poſteritie ſhould live in him; and if he ſinned, they ſhould all die in him: it ſeemeth reaſonable, that we ſhould have

have had as much good by him, as we have had harm from him, and he being to have been confirmed in grace, upon the overcoming of the first suggestion, should have begot us his children, not voluble, deambulatory, and pendulous, but like himself confirm'd in grace. For as the Angels were confirm'd in grace, so soon as they had declar'd them-selves to adhere to God; (or els, when were they confirm'd, or are they not confirmed yet? * *Presently after one act informed with charitie the Angels were blessed,* saith Aquine) so should Adam have been confirmed presently, if he had powerfully adhered to God. Yea, I think if he had but at that first suggestion disliked Eves eating, or rather kept her and himself from consenting to the eating, that nor they, nor any of their posterity should ever have eaten of the forbidden fruit. But as it was placed at first in Paradise, to be their Shibboleth of triall, so ever after it should have continued as a Symbol onely of their obedience. Again, by this my opinion, *That all Adams issue should have been confirmed in his confirmation*, Gods justice is defended from aspersions cast upon it, for damning some little children for the sinne of Adam, which sinne they did neither commit nor could avoid. And the fault of not avoiding it was no way arising from them; because they who can not avoid certain damnation by Adam, might also have received as certain salvation by him, without their own victorie over any temptation; which could not be, unless by his confirmed innocency every one of his issue had been confirm'd in grace. Anselmus cometh home to my thoughts, saying thus, * *The first men yeelding to the temptation have subjected all mankinde that was to be born of them, to the necessitie of sinne. Therefore if they had overcome that temptation, they had both themselves been presently confirmed in righteousnes by the merit of that victorie, and had also transmitted to the whole posteritie the same benefit of confirmed righteousnes.* Estius answereth Anselm thus; *The way is easier to the necessity of evill, then of good; as to incurable diseases, rather then to a stable health.* I reply thus on Estius, That his instances are in decaied nature, which reach not to our point; That the way was equally alike at first to Adam; or rather easier to goodnes, in which he was, then to sin in which he was not: yea, in this our present infeebled estate, one habitually grounded in vertue shall finde the passage over unto sinne more difficult, perplexing, thorny, and laborious, then the continuing in goodnes. Out of Scotus his doctrine let me observe three points. First, he confesseth * *All their children had kept their righteousnes, not because they could not but keep it.* So they could have sinned, but should not, in his opinion. But are not they confirm'd, who though they could sinne, yet should not be suffered to sinne? Secondly, this confirmation in grace, being a supernaturall gift, had not been transfused by Adam, but

*Statim post unum actum charitate informatum Angelus beatus fuit. Aquin. part. 1. quæst. 62. art. 5.

*Anselm. lib. 1. *Cur Deus homo.* cap. 18. * *Primi homines succumbentes temptationi, totum genus humanum ex ipsis nasciturum subjecerunt necessitati peccati. Quare si eam temptationem superassent & ipsi statim illius victoriæ merito fuissent in justitia confirmati, & idem confirmatæ justitiæ beneficium ad totam posteritatem transmississent.*

*Omnes nati servâssent justitiam, non quia non servare non potuissent.

but ſuperadded by God unto every one, as well as the gift of originall juſtice and grace. I ſhould have aſked no more of Scotus, if he had ſaid it ſhould have been given to us of God, not for our perſonall vanquiſhing the firſt temptation, but for our obedience in Adam, according to Gods compact with him. Thirdly, confirmation in grace is of two ſorts, one fitting to the ſtate of a *Comprehenſor*, or of ſupreme glorification. This confirmation at its height and in its excellence, nor Adam himſelf, if he had ſtood, nor his innocent iſſue ſhould have had, till their terrene bodies had been tranſlated into ſpirituall. The other confirmation agreeth with a *Viator*, which is not without a poſſibilitie of ſinne, but having infallible cuſtodie, that he ſhall not ſinne mortally. *This* (ſaith Scotus, and the Scholium on him) *Adams innocent iſſue ſhould have had.* But could they, being confirm'd, have ſinned venially? Let me adde two ſpeculations more. Firſt, God could not make a creature in which there ſhould not ſometime be a peccabilitie, ſince that is a propertie onely of the Almightie. If that tying of Gods hand ſeem harſh to any unconverſant in the Schools, I mitigate it thus, by the like inſtance out of * Scaliger, *When unto any thing God by his infinite powerfull perfection doth adde perfection, he muſt at laſt ſurceaſe from bettering it, and come to a* NIL VLTRA: *for he can not make* ENS ESSENTIA INFINITVM, *a thing of infinite eſſence; for he ſhould make another God. Which words you muſt not underſtand, as if we ſtinted Gods Almightie power, but rather thus, That God can alwayes better any thing, even to infinitie; but the creature and thing it ſelf is not ſuſceptible of that infinitie; the imperfection reſting not in God, but in the creature.* To that effect Scaliger: and it may be aptly applied to the making of a creature ſimply impeccable. Secondly, God did make Adam with a full free-will, and a power to ſinne or not to ſinne. Our will was in his, and, without offence to the Schools, as in him we were in a ſort and in one kinde *Viatores*, before his fall; ſo if he had ſtood, wee had been, as he himſelf ſhould, in a leſſer degree, *Comprehenſores*. For though Aquine maketh but ſimply ſinglie one confirmation in grace, yet Scotus maketh a twofold confirmation: and though Scotus ſaith, *Viator & Comprehenſor diſtinguuntur, ſicut eſſe circa terminum & eſſe in termino*; yet there is a juſt diſtinction between *Eſſe in termino completè, & eſſe in termino incompleté.* Chriſt in ſome ſenſe may be ſaid to have been both *Viator* and *Comprehenſor*. If Adam had been confirmed ere he fell, he had been in ſome degree *Comprehenſor*: ſo had we; and yet both he and we ſhould have been in ſome ſort *Viatores in termino incompleto*, as not having obtained life unchangeable, and bodies ſpirituall, which was to be the compleatorie perfection of humane bliſſe. More arguments might I uſe, but they may be gathered in the anſwers unto the objections before cited.

* Scal. Exercit. 249. in fine.

And

And first, the great S. Auguſtine hath many obſervable paſſages to this point. First, *That onely Adam was made of earth: that this gradation is not required, namely, that he ſhould be firſt created a childe, then become a youth, then a man,* De Geneſ. ad litteram 6. 13. And in the Chapter following,* *Adam is thought to have been made in mans age, without any growth or further increaſe.* And more reſolvedly, De peccatorum Merit. & Remiſſ. 2. 27.* *As for the quantitie of body, Adam was not made little, but of a perfect bigneſſe of members.* Secondly, in the laſt cited place Auguſtine maketh this Quære, *If Adam and Eve had not ſinned, Whether their young children ſhould have been able to go, ſpeak, or the like?* And he anſwereth, *Perhaps it was neceſſaric they ſhould be born little, according to the capacitie of the wombe: but as God made Eve no little woman of a little rib, ſo the omnipotent Creator might have made their little children newly born, preſently to be great: Even many beaſts, a while after they are born, runne and follow after their dammes; much more might he have done for men, and given them even preſent uſe of their members.* Thirdly, though Lombard rather inclineth to them who ſay, that the new-born children of innocent Adam ſhould have growen by degrees, and not have been preſently able to exerciſe their limmes: though accordingly he inclineth to them, who think that thoſe innocent infants upon their birth ſhouſd have had little ſenſe or underſtanding, but by time ſhould acquire proficiencie and perfection; yet I rather imagine, they ſhould preſently upon their birth have had perfect uſe of body and minde, (though I deny not experimentall augmentations) both becauſe there is a nearer reſemblance unto Adam, who was ſo created, and a further diſtance & diſſimilitude from the eſtate of our corrupted nature, which creepeth *ſenſim, pedetentim, & gradatim*, by little and little, and is incompetent to the perfection of innocencie. Yea Eſtius himſelf fighteth againſt Lombards diſcourſe, and ſaith, *Innocent Adams children ſhould have had uſe of reaſon from their very nativitie, and perhaps even in their mothers wombe ſhould have had ſome ſmall knowledge of God*: and confirmeth his opinion by Auguſtine De peccat. Merit. & Remiſſ. lib. 1. Cap. 36. & lib. 2. Cap. 29. and Confeſſ. 1. 7. and De Civit. 22. 22. *Where* (ſaith he) *Auguſtine ſpeaketh not of an habituall knowledge onely, but of the act and uſe of knowledge.* Therefore if Auguſtine were not to be expounded, as he is by Halenſis, of confirmation in obedience upon the firſt temptation; yet they will get little footing by that learned Fathers authoritie, if they wil weigh one place with an other, which are hereafter to be cited out of him; to which, that I may ſhortē this point, I refer you.

I come now unto Eſtius, who had his firſt reaſon from Aquine & Scotus. *Adam & Eve* (ſay they) *had not begotten children in a better condition then themſelves were created by God; there-*

*Creditur factus Adam virili ætate, ſine ullo progreſſu incrementorum.

*Quod pertinet ad corporis quantitatem, Adam non factus eſt parvulus, ſed perfectâ mole membrorum.

fore they ſhould have begot juſt children, but not confirmed in grace.
Firſt, I anſwer, that though God made all things very good at the creation, yet he might after (if he would) and may yet (if he will) make things better then they were at the creation. Secondly, *Stapleton quoteth this from Auguſtine, *The firſt man did receive a more pleaſant grace, we a more powerfull.* Neither doth Whitaker diſlike this, though he confute much of that Chap. of Stapleton: Now, if we in this forlorn eſtate have more powerfull grace then Adam, why not in that eſtate? Thirdly, though the children of innocent Adam might have more grace intenſively then he, yet Adam had had more extenſively: for his righteouſnes had benefitted the whole World, theirs had redounded but to their own perſons. Fourthly, let us take a more diſtinct view of their ſeverall gifts. Adam receiveth originall juſtice, to ſtand (if he would) for himſelf and the whole World: his iſſue receive by his ſtanding this grace more then he had at firſt, (though he had it before he begot them) that they cannot fall by themſelves as he might. As for this, that their children ſhould not fall, but that all their generation ſhould have been confirmed in grace, it proceedeth not from their immediate parents, but from Adam as the root. Now then, weigh in a balance theſe two graces together (which the Schoolmen neglected) certainly the grace given unto Adam was (all things conſidered) more powerfull, more abundant. As if God ſhould give, in preſent poſſeſſion, unto one man enough of worldly wealth, to ſerve ſufficiently, yea abundantly for himſelf and his ſeed for ever, if he would huſband it well. Secondly, if after this God ſhould ſuperadde unto his ſonne, this gift more then he gave unto the father at firſt, namely, this grace, that he ſhould not have power to diminiſh this wealth, for ſo much as concerned his own perſon; which of theſe two, the father or the ſonne, had the greater gift? I doubt not but *Calculator* would hold, that the father had. Again, if Adā had begot children beforeever he had ſeen the tree of good and evill, as was poſſible, he had begot children as himſelf was created, juſt, but unconfirmed. The concluſion of *Aquine, or extracted out of Aquine, is unworthie of him, and ſo are his own words, * *So long as the parents had begotten, they had not been confirmed in juſtice: for hence is a reaſonable creature confirmed in juſtice, that it is made happy by the open ſight of God.* I anſwer, that the beatificall viſion is the complement, perfection, and boundarie of all confirmation in juſtice: but there may be a kinde of confirmation in juſtice without the beatificall, preſent, apert viſion of God, or ſuch as ſhall be in the ſtate glorified. For ſince Aquine there confeſſeth, *That the thrice holy Mother of our Holieſt All-holy Saviour might by eſpeciall priviledge generate, and yet enjoy the apert viſion of God*, I ſee not why Adam and

*Stapl. *De Peccato Originali* lib. 1. cap. 15. * *Primus homo latiorem, nos potentiorem gratiam accepimus.*

*Aquin part. 1. quæſt. 100. art. 2. In corpore articuli. *Parentes quandiu generáſſent, non fuiſſent confirmati in juſtitia: ex hoc enim creatura rationalis in juſtitia confirmatur, quòd efficitur beata per apertam Dei viſionem.*

and Eve continuing innocent might not do the like, or beget children confirmed in grace, and yet generate; which he denieth. Becauſe the ſuppoſed priviledge of the All-gracious Virgin doth not derogate from the glorie of our moſt bleſſed Redeemer, I will not contradict it; though it maketh her more perfect then God made Adam and Eve in their integritie. Laſtly, why might not generating parents be confirmed in grace, when in the act there ſhould have been no turpitude, no ſalacious motion, no laſcivious titillation; and thoſe members might have been uſed without any itch of tickliſh pleaſure, as our hands and feet and ſome other parts are now? Reade S. Auguſtine *De Civit.* 14.24. and 26. moſt fully of theſe things. Unto Eſtius his ſecond reaſon, which is this, *Angels were not ordained to bleſſednes, but by the merit of their free-will; and man was not firſt to be placed at the goal or end, but in the way:* I anſwer, Every Angel was to ſtand or fall by his own proper actuall free-will. Man was unlike to them therein; Adams actuall conſent for us, ſtood exactly for the actuall conſent of each Angel; for no Angel fell in Lucifer, as we did in Adam. But to the ſecond branch of his argument, I confeſſe with Aquine,* *The ſoul of man and an Angel are alike ordained to bleſſednes.* The way was neceſſarie before the goal, the means before the end. But I muſt adde, Adam was in the way, and we in the way by him and in him: and as he brought us out of the way by his ſtraying by-path, ſo by his undeviation we had been kept in the way. More might be added, but the Queſtion hath ſwollen above its banks already. I muſt be brief, though I be obſcure.

*Anima hominis & Angelus ſimiliter ad beatitudinem ordinantur.

What Hugo and Lombard require, was performed by Adam for us. Though Eſtius in this point maketh God like an hard taſk-maſter, and man a meer journy-man; yet much was given to him who deſerved little; even for one onely, and the eaſieſt houres work. So might God have done to us for his promiſe unto Adams obedience for us. In that eſtate, perhaps, he needed no merit challenging due reward; as there ſhall be no new recompenſe for deſert, after we are glorified. But if merit had had place, it might after confirmation in grace have procured ſpeedier tranſlation to an unchangeable life; & the accidentals of beatitude might have been increaſed in us, as they ſhall be in the Angels of light, though long ſince they were confirmed in grace.

Scotus objecteth, *The children of innocent Adam ſhould have been Viatores, in the way to happines; therefore they might have been ſinners.* I anſwer, *Viator* is conſidered according to a twofold eſtate. Firſt, for him that walketh in a ſlippery and dangerous way, where he may be *in* or out. Thus was Adam *Viator*, thus were we *Viatores* in Adam before his fall, and thus we could have ſinned, yea did ſinne; which is

more then Scotus his argument evinceth. Secondly, *Viator* is taken according to the eſtate of him who walketh in a good ſure way, where no by-path can be made. Thus we being confirmed ſhould have been *Viatores*, and yet could not have been ſinners; and herein we had been like to bleſſed Angels; yea the ſame man might have been *Viator* in one regard, and *Comprehenſor* in an other reſpect at the ſame time. So was Chriſt, ſo had Adam and his children been upon confirmation in goodnes; not that they ſhould have had that plenitude of comprehenſion which is to be enjoyed after the generall judgement, but ſuch a comprehenſion which had been agreeable to that preſent eſtate, (though ſuſceptible of degrees, and capable of more perfection) where *Comprehenſor* is ſynonymous with *beatus* onely, but not *beatiſsimus*. The ſame Scotus further reaſoneth thus:

The grace confirmed by the Merit of Chriſt in Baptiſme, or other Sacraments confirm not the receiver;
Therefore much leſſe ſhould any Merit of any parent or childe have confirmed us in juſtice.

I anſwer, The confirmation had rather been from Gods gracious promiſe to Adam and his ſeed, then from any merit properly ſo called. Secondly, The graces of Chriſt exhibited in the Sacraments of initiation and corroboration ſhall draw us up to an infallible confirmation in the eſtate of glorie; where we ſhall have more comfort, delight, and good by Chriſt, then we had harm by Adam, if he had not fallen: of which hereafter.

To ſome arguments and authorities for my opinion, ſome anſwers are ſhaped by the Schoolmen. I will looſe the argument from S. Gregorie, becauſe it ingendereth more queſtions, when this is too copiouſly handled already.

Anſelm ſpeaketh home for me, if ever man ſpake; Aquinas ſaith, *He did it opining, not affirming:* Yet he ſaw the reaſon which induced Anſelm to that Aſſertion. Scotus alſo ſlubbereth over the authoritie of Anſelm, winking, as it ſeemeth, when he ſhould have read the direct words. * Dionyſius ſaith, *Bonum eſt potentius malo: Good hath more power and vertue then evill.* But (ſay I) for the ſinne of the firſt man came a neceſſitie of ſinning upon all his children; Therefore if he had ſtood, there ſhould have been a neceſſitie of not ſinning. Scotus anſwereth in the firſt place, as if Dionyſius were to be underſtood *of a great Evill, and a little Good*, which plainely that Father never meant. Secondly, he jumpeth in ſenſe with Aquine, and both do anſwer, *That we are not ſo neceſsitated to ſinning, that we can not return to juſtice, and Adams ſinne was not cauſe of our confirmation in evill.* I reply, we are ſo neceſſitated by our nature, that of our ſelves and from our ſelves we can not return to juſtice. We are obſtinate and confirmed in evill, in regard of our own diſabi-

* Dion. *De Divinis Nominibus* cap. 4.

disabilities; though not confirmed in evill, nor obstinate, if we consider the powerfull mercy of God. And this is enough to make the argument hold good. There should have been a necessitie of not sinning of our part; otherwise, *Evill should have been more powerfull then Good*, which is the contradictorie to Dionysius. For we can not but sinne of our selves, and are obstinate; though we are not so obstinate as the damned, nor should have been so confirmed by Adam as the glorified shall be.

Unto our argument drawn from the similitude of Angelicall reward, Aquinas answereth, *Men and Angels are not alike.* I reply, We were both like in some things, and unlike in other: but in this we had been like, That as the Angels were confirmed presently upon their first obedience, so had Adam been confirmed, and we in him. For God loved not Man worse then the Angels; *For Christ verily took not on him the nature of Angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham*, Heb. 2.16. Scotus yeeldes himself captive to the force of this reason, save onely that he opineth, That every one of Adams children should, as well as Adam, have been confirmed in grace, upon their actuall overcoming of the first temptation suggested unto them; whereas I maintain, That Adams representation of us, and his obedience, should have done us equall good, to our resisting of the first temptation.

More might pertinently be said of this matter: but besides the precedent tediousnesse of it, Ludovicus Vives *aurem vellit*, endeavouring to restrain such speculations to modest bounds. Thus he saith on Augustine *De Civit. 13.1. Of things which might, or might not have happened to man, if Adam had not fallen; * What fell out, to our great harm, no man is ignorant of: what should have befallen, I know not whether it was revealed to Adam himself; how much lesse to us poore wretches? For what availeth it to use conjectures, in a thing which is above all humane conjectures?* But Vives himself is to blame. First, for his nesciencie, or timerousnesse; as if Adam knew not, what estate he and his should have had, if he had persevered in innocency. The ignorance of a point so nearely concerning him, had argued imperfection; which the fulnes of knowledge, in which he was created, did clearly dispell. For if God said to the corrupted World, Deut. 30.19. *I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you Life and Death*, could uncorrupt Adam be ignorant of the life that was set before him? Or did Adam understand the miseries and punishments, the orts and effects of *Morte Morieris*, expressely threatned against him, in a future contingent estate; and could he be ignorant of his present condition of blisse, and certain blisse to be increased upon his obedience? Did he know the natures of beasts, and other creatures; could he know the strange production of Eve, could he prophetically

* *Quid factum sit, magno nostro malo, nemo ignorat; quid fuisset, nescio an ipsi Adam ostensum fuit; quantò minus nobis miseris? Nam quid prodest uti conjecturis, in re quæ conjecturas omnes superat humanas?*

phetically intimate the ſtrict union of Chriſt with his Church, by his own conjunction with Eve; and was it not ſhewed unto him, what ſtate he ſhould have had, and we in him? Secondly, though theſe things be taxed of nicetie, yet the impartiall Reader, overviewing this Book, perhaps will ſay, It was profitable and delightfull to problematize even upon this very point. But other matters invite me hence forward to them; and therefore having cleared, That it was the ſinne of Adam, of onely Adam, and not of Eve, for which Death was appointed, Let us proceed to examine, Which and what this ſinne of Adam was; which is next and neceſſarily to be handled.

O Moſt glorious Creator, who did'ſt make us in the Firſt Adam excellent Creatures, and wouldeſt have made us better, if he who undertook for us, had not brought upon us death and deſtruction; Grant, I beſeech thee, for thy mercies ſake, in the Merit and Mediation of the Second Adam, Jeſus Chriſt our onely Saviour, That we may recover our loſt Image, and be made like unto him here, and reigne in Life with him hereafter.

CHAP. IIII.

1. *Adams perfection in Innocencie. Our imperfection after his fall, contrarie to his, both in understanding and will, and in the parts concupiscible and irascible.*

2. *Adam had other laws given him: but one above all, and one onely concerning posteritie.*

3. *What this Law was. Adam knew the danger to himself and his offspring. The first sinne was against this Law.*

4. *Eve sinned before. How she sinned the same, and not the same sinne with Adam.*

5. *Zeno, the Stoicks, and Jovinian confuted. Sinnes are not equally sinfull.*

6 *Adam sinned farre more and worse then Eve.*

7 *This sinne of Adam was not uxoriousnesse, as Scotus maintained, but disobedience or pride. The branches of Adams sinne.*

1 LOmbard saith, *Some are of opinion that Adam before the fall had no vertue.* He had not justice (say they) because he despised Gods commandement; nor prudence, because he provided not for himself; nor temperance, for his appetite extended to the forbidden fruit; nor fortitude, for he yeelded to suggestion. *We answer*, saith Lombard, *He had not these vertues when he sinned, but before, and in sinning losed them.* For Augustine in a certain Homily saith, *Adam was made according to the Image of God, armed with shamefastnesse, composed with temperance, splendent with charitie.* Otherwhere he saith, *Adam was endued with a spirituall minde.* Ambrose saith, **He was most happy, and led an heavenly life*; and addeth a good observation, **When Adam was alone, he transgressed not.* Which may teach us to fear the enticements of companie. This point deserveth not to be so speedily cast off: and therefore attend this further enlargement.

* *Quibusdam videtur quòd Adam ante lapsum non habuerit virtutem.* Lomb. Sent 2. dist. 29. lit. B.

* *Beatissimus erat, & auram carpebat ætheream.*

* *Quando Adam solus erat, non est prævaricatus.*

Many, very many precepts were graven in the heart of Adam, and every branch of the naturall Law was there written by the finger of God, at his Creation; nor was he ignorant, what was to be done or omitted in any businesse. Eccl. 17. 1. *The Lord created man of the earth:* and verse 2. he changeth the

ſingular into the plural, *He gave them power over the things therein:* and verſe 3. *He endued them with ſtrength by themſelves, and made them according to his image:* And then followeth an excellent deſcription of their gifts. I conceive, and explain the matter thus: Foure faculties he had, and we have of our ſouls, { Two ſuperior. Two inferior.

The two ſuperior are underſtanding and will; The two inferior, the part iraſcible and part concupiſcible. Firſt, the object of his underſtanding was truth, the perfection of it was knowledge: but now, as we are in the ſtate decaied, this truth is darkned with ignorance, 1 Corinth. 2.14. *The naturall man receiveth not, nor can know the things of the Spirit of God.* Eph. 4.18. *Their underſtanding is darkned, and their hearts are blinde.* Pſal. 49.20. *Man in honour underſtandeth not.* As Adam was in innocencie, he was partaker of the truth. The Apoſtle, Epheſ. 4. 23, 24. ſaith, *Be renewed in the ſpirit of your minde.* New we were once in Adam, and in him alſo we grew old: we are commanded to be renewed as new as once we were; and *put on that new man, which was created in righteouſneſſe and holineſſe of truth*; therefore the firſt Adam was created in truth. You have the object, *Truth*; the perfection was *Knowledge*, Eccleſiaſticus 17.7. *God filled them with knowledge and underſtanding:* and this is ſeconded by the Apoſtle, Coloſ. 3.10. *The new man is renewed in knowledge, after the image of him that created him.* Renovation neceſſarily implieth precedent oldnes; and oldnes, precedent newnes of knowledge in the firſt Adam. Secondly, the object of mans will, was, and is, *Goodneſſe*; the perfection, *Love*. In the decayed eſtate the will is infected with *vanitie*, Geneſ. 6.5. *Every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was onely evill continually.* Epheſ. 4.17. *We walk in the vanitie of our minde.* In the ſtate of integritie it was farre otherwiſe: Adam was new in his minde, and holy and righteous, as was proved before: in which regard * Chryſoſtom ſaith, *Adam was a terreſtriall Angel.* *Baſil reckoneth up, as Adams chief good in Paradiſe, *His ſitting with God, and conjunction by love.* As all things els, ſo Adams will was good, and tended unto good; there is the object: his love in innocencie was entire, and united to God; there was his perfection. Thirdly, the object of his, and our part concupiſcible, is moderate delight: the perfection and felicitie of it, was contentment. As now, this part is gauled with inſatiable itchings, and *given over to laſciviouſneſſe, to work all uncleanneſſe with greedines,* Epheſ. 4.19. But at the firſt Adam was free. Auguſtine ſaith, * *There the grace of God was great, where an earthy and ſenſuall body had no beaſtly luſt.* The place he was in, was a Paradiſe of pleaſure, a garden of delight; nothing was wanting which might give true content. Fourthly, the object of his and our iraſcible part may in a ſort be called *Difficulty*, or rather *Conſtancy*;

*Chryſ. Hom. 16. in Gen.

*Baſ. Homil. *Quòd Deus non ſit author malorum.*

*Gratia Dei ibi magna erat, ubi terrenum & animale corpus beſtialem libidinem non habebat.

ſtancy; whoſe glory of endeavours, end, and felicitie, was *Victorie*. This part now is much weakned with infirmitie. In the beſt of us, the Fleſh luſteth againſt the Spirit, and (alas!) we are often vanquiſhed, as being weak by nature: But Adam was ſtrong, and could have overcome any temptation. Auguſtine ſaith, * *Our firſt parents were happy, being neither ſhaken with any trouble of minde, nor hurt with any infirmitie of body.* * *Adam had no need of that help which theſe crave, when they ſay, I ſee another law in my members, &c.* Yea he is more bold there, ſaying, * *Adam in thoſe good things wherein he was created, had no need of Chriſts death.* He had, with libertie and will, grace ſufficient, whereby he might have triumphed over all difficulties and temptations. Auguſtine thus, * *In Paradiſe before ſinne although Adam could not do all things, yet he then would not do whatſoever he could not, and therefore could do all that he would.* Adam having theſe excellent endowments of nature and grace, had alſo neceſſarily certain objects, about which they ſhould be converſant. Theſe objects were, all the parts, and branches of the Law of nature, whereby he fully knew his dutie. And all and every one of theſe he did for a while, or at the leaſt not break: and he and his poſteritie ſhould, and ought to fulfill, as they were private perſons: and for the performance and non-performance thereof, both he and we ſhould, and ſhall anſwer unto God, at the high Throne and Tribunall of the juſt and righteous Judge.

2. But there was one precept, and onely one, given to Eve, (perhaps to all Adams poſteritie, as private perſons: who, if they had eaten of the tree of knowledge of good and evill, can not be imagined, that they could have ruinated all mankinde:) but commanded to Adam onely, as the publick perſon, as the Idea of humane nature, as the ſtock and root, by whoſe obedience or diſobedience all mankinde was to be happie or unhappie, as the figure of Chriſt to come. And this ſin was not to be a ſin of thought onely, as the ſin of the Angels, who each of them ſinned by his own expreſſed will; but ſuch a ſinne, as might bring a deſerved blot, and puniſhment upon all his poſteritie, who were in him: which could not be, unles it had been committed both by his ſoul and his body, and thereby had power to infect all the parts, and faculties both of ſouls and bodies. Again, the body of Adam could not ſinne without the ſoul, neither could this be a ſinne of the ſoul alone, without ſome concurrents of the bodily parts; for then Adams ſinning ſoul ſhould have been damned, and his innocent bodie ſaved: but it was to be a ſinne compounded of inward averſion and outward tranſgreſsion. So that if Adam had ſeen Eve eat, and had himſelf luſted after the fruit, and yet before the orall manducation had diſliked his liking, had feared the puniſhment, and

* *Felices erant primi homines, nullis agitabantur perturbationibus animorum, nullis corporis ladebantur incommodis.* De Civit. 14. 10.

* *Adam non opus habebat eo adjutorio quod implorant iſti, cùm dicunt, Video aliam legem in membris meis,* &c. Lib. De Corrept. & Gratia.

* *Adam in illis bonis, in quibus creatus eſt Chriſti morte non eguit.* Ibid.

* *In Paradiſo etiamſi omnia non poterat Adam ante peccatum, quicquid tum non poterat non volebat, & ideo poterat omnia quæ volebat.* De Civit. 14. 15.

and not proceeded to *eat* of it, or *touch* it, I do not think his poſteritie had been engaged, as they are. Auguſtine citeth this out of S. Ambroſe, and approveth it, * *If Adams ſoul had bridled the bodily appetite in the very beginning, the originall of ſinne had been quenched.*

Si anima Adami appetentiam corporis refranâſſet in ipſo ortu, extincta eſſet origo peccati. Cont. Julian. Pelag. lib. 2.

Catharinus thinketh there was an expreſſe covenant between God and Adam, that Adam and his poſteritie ſhould be bleſſed or curſed, according to the breaking or keeping of that one law. What Catharinus ſaith is probable, and may be moſt true, though it be not ſo written. For firſt, if the prohibition had concerned Adams perſon onely, ſince the precept was given before Eve was created, Adam onely ſhould have taſted of death, and not Eve. Secondly, queſtionleſſe that law and covenant included poſteritie, as is verified in the event. When *Morte Morieris* was threatned unto Adam, he was then *Rectus in Curia*, and ſtood as a publique perſon, repreſenting all his branches. If it concerned him, as a private perſon, he onely ſhould perſonally have died, and we eſcaped: but our dying in him evinceth, that he was reputed (if I may ſo ſay) a generall, univerſall feoffee or perſon, to whoſe freewill the happie or unhappie future eſtate of all his deſcendants was intruſted; conditionally, to live for ever, upon the obſervance of one law; or to die the death, for the breach of it. Life and death was propounded,† *Not to one man, but to all mankinde.*

†Non uni, ſed univerſitati.

3. And this law is regiſtred, and recorded, Geneſ. 2.17. *Of the tree of the knowledge of good and evill thou ſhalt not eat; for in the day that thou eateſt thereof, thou ſhalt ſurely die.* Which words I verily beleeve that Adam underſtood (either by his naturall wiſedome, which was very great, or by divine conference or revelation, which to him was not unfrequent) to involve his poſteritie as well as himſelf. For if immediatly upon the creation of woman, Adam could foreſee and propheſie, Geneſ. 2.24. *That a man ſhall leave his Father and Mother, and cleave to his wife; and they two ſhall be one fleſh:* and by the ſame words, perhaps, underſtand Chriſt and his Church, and that myſterie explained by S. Paul, Epheſ. 5.31, &c. (thoſe being the words of Adam, as † Epiphanius ſaith, of Adam ſpeaking unto God, ſpeaking the truth of God; and in this reſpect (as I conceive) Chriſt ſaith, Matth. 19.4, &c. theſe words are the words of God, of the Creator; as all light is from the Sunne, ſo all truth from God; as on the contrarie, all lies are from the Devill) I ſay, if Adam could foreſee marriages, generations, cohabitations, myſteries, and future uſances; he could not be ignorant, that that law was given him to keep to the bliſſe of all mankinde, and the contempt thereof would draw on the deſtruction of his poſteritie. And (I think) I ſhall not erre, if I collect from the correlative correſpondencie, which muſt be between the Type

†Epiph. *Contra Ptolemaitas.*

and

and the Antitype, the ſhadow and the ſubſtance, That the firſt Adam knew his παρακοὴ or diſobedience was ſufficient to bring deſtruction on all mankinde, as the ſecond Adam knew that his ὑπακοὴ or obedience, was a ſufficient redemption for the ſinnes of all the World. Durand fooliſhly preſuppoſeth, that the will of Adam ſinning was ours onely *concomitativè & interpretativè*, becauſe we loſt originall juſtice, when Adam ſinned, beyond his thoughts or intentions. * Stapleton ſaith truly, *If Adam intended no ſuch thing with an actuall intention, yet he did it with a virtuall intention.* But I rather think, that the word *If* may be cut off, and we may ſay, Adam did, as Eſau afterward, prefer temporals before ſpirituals, and as all the ſonnes of Adam do at one time or other; for he was not ignorant of the danger, yet embraced it: and he might ſay within himſelf, — *Video meliora, probóque, Deteriora ſequor----* * Auguſtine hath this wittie *Quære*, *Whether Adam and Eve foreknew their fall?* For if he did before hand know that he ſhould ſinne, and that God would revenge it, whence could he be happie? and ſo he was in Paradiſe, yet not happie. If he did not foreknow his fall; then by this ignorance he was either uncertain of that bleſſedneſſe; and how was he then truly bleſſed? or certain by a falſe hope, and not by a right knowledge; and then how was he not a fool? I anſwer, They did not know that they ſhould fall, or ſinne; for there was no neceſſitie laid upon them; and to know the unalterable certaintie of a thing contingent (as their future eſtate was) is to take away the nature of its contingencie, and to make it unavoidable. But for all this ignorance, they were certain enough of bleſſedneſſe, if they would themſelves; and their wills and perſons were in Paradiſe bleſſed, though changeable, though not ſo wholy bleſſed as good Angels are, or as the Saints ſhall be. For if we ſay, Nothing is bleſſed but what hath attained abſolute certainty, and the height of bleſſedneſſe; the very bleſſed Spirits of heaven ſhall not be ſaid to be bleſſed, eſpecially if they be compared with God, who onely is bleſſed. And ſo Adam and Eve were *beati modo quodam inferiori, non tamen nullo*, that I anſwer in Auguſtines words. Again, to the former part of this Queſtion I anſwer, That they knew before hand that they could ſinne, and that God would puniſh them, if they did ſinne; and yet for all this, they had the grace given to ſtand, if they would, and ſo to avoid both ſinne and puniſhment; and withall they knew that they had that grace. But if before hand they had known, or could have known that they ſhould have ſinned, they could not have been happie in Paradiſe, yet, as they were in Paradiſe, they were happie, though they knew not that they ſhould fall. For if men on earth may be called *Saints*, *Saints of light*, *Bleſſed*, (as they are often) and *Spirituall*, Galat. 6. 1, though they were in their bodies

* Stap. *De Originali Peccato* 1. 9.

*Aug. De Gen. ad lit. 11. 18.

bodies to paſſe through both temptations and tribulations, and can not divers times but fall: much more Adam might be termed *Bleſſed* in Paradiſe, who though he ſaw he might fall, yet he ſaw alſo he might have ſtood; *and ſo rejoyced*, ſaith Auguſtine himſelf, *for the reward to come, that he endured no tribulation for the preſent.* Laſtly, to S. Auguſtines three-headed *Dilemma* I anſwer by diſtinguiſhing. There is a threefold ignorance. The firſt is *pravæ diſpoſitionis*, when one is prepoſſeſſed with a falſe opinion, excluding knowledge: this may be called *poſitive ignorance*, or *plain errour.* The ſecond is *ignorantia privationis*, when a man knoweth not what he is bound to know: neither of theſe can conſiſt with bleſſedneſſe, nor was in innocent Adam. But there is a third, viz. *ignoratio ſimplicis neſcientiæ*, when we know not ſuch things as we need not to know. This was in Adam, and is in good Angels: yea Chriſt himſelf knew not ſome things. This ignorance is not ſinfull, nor erronious, not making either imaginarily happie, or fooliſh.

This great law, in Tertullians phraſe is ſtiled * *The Mother-law, breeding all other laws: which had been ſufficient for them, if they had kept it*, ſaith he. * Auguſtine and * Chryſoſtom agree in this, *That Adams firſt ſinne onely maketh us culpable.* * Chryſoſtom calleth it πρώτην ἁμαρτίαν. *The firſt ſinne.* Auguſtin ſaith that * *Onely the firſt tranſgreſſion of Adam is paſſed upon the poſteritie, becauſe the whole nature is corrupted by that firſt ſinne.* Therefore when a childe is born, he hath originall ſinne, and death the wages thereof annexed as due to it; not becauſe he is a creature, not becauſe he is a perſon, not becauſe he is a perſon of mankinde or humane nature, not becauſe he deſcended from his immediate or mediate parents, not becauſe they came from Eve, not onely becauſe he was in the loyns of Adam, of ſinning or ſinfull Adam; but becauſe he was in Adam when he firſt ſinned, and implicitly gave his conſent to the committing of that firſt tranſgreſſion, and that primarie averſion which hath led us aſtray ever ſince.

4. Some have held, that Eve ſinned before ſhe talked with the Serpent. So * Rupertus and * Ferus. But certainly ſhe ſinned before Adam, & being carried headlong with the *Bonũ apparens*, did little imagine to work ſo much miſchief. Had ſhe known that her huſbands yeelding ſhould neceſſarily and infallibly bring forth death to him and all his poſteritie, and after that have offered him the forbidden fruit, ſhe had been full of deceit, and her intentions had been ſtained with the juſt aſperſion of ſeducement. But ſhe might think her ſinne was little or none, and perſwade herſelf ſhe ſhould not die, and relate that perſwaſion to her huſband; or think onely of Gods mercy, who had never taſted of his judgements. And, perhaps, he ſeeing that ſhe had touched the fruit, and was not dead, ſunk under her

*Lex primordialis, generalis, & quaſi matrix omnium præceptorum Dei.
*Aug. De Civit. 14. 12
*Chryſ. Homil. 41. in Acta Apoſt.
†Chryſ. in Epheſ. 6.
*Prima duntaxat Adæ tranſgreſſio tranſit in poſteros, quia illo primo peccato univerſa natura corrupta eſt. Cont. Julian. 3. 6.

*Rup. lib. 3. De Operib. Trinit. in Gen. cap. 5.
* Ferus in Gen. 3.

her enticements, and did eat. Before I part with this point, two queſtions more muſt needs be anſwered. Firſt, Whether Eve ſinned the ſame ſinne with Adam? Secondly, Whether of their ſinnes were the greateſt? Concerning the firſt, I anſwer, In regard that both of them knew, that to eat of the forbidden fruit was unlawfull and diſpleaſing to God, and yet did eat, they ſinned the ſame ſinne: but as the commandment was given to Adam before Eves creation, as Adam was the root of mankinde, and as his poſterity was to ſtand or fall in him onely, and not in Eve, ſo ſhe ſinned not the ſame ſinne with Adam. She ſinned the ſame ſinne, in reſpect of the outward eating, not in regard of the inward obligation: She ſinned the ſame *ſin in ſe*, ſo much as concerned her own perſon; ſhe ſinned not the ſame ſinne *extenſivè erga alios*. For as her good actions, conſidered by themſelves, ſhould not have been the rule or ſquare according to which our humane natures ſhould have been framed; (but for all her uprightnes, if Adam had ſinned we had died) ſo her ſinne or ſinnes, ſetting Adam apart, had not extended to the corruption or deſtruction of mankinde.

Though in innocencie they did ſee much, yet they could then ſee no deformitie: nay, though Eve had ſinned, and ſinned divers ſinnes before Adam ſinned any; (for ſhe beleeved the Serpent, diſtruſted God, fell to unlawfull deſires, and did eat) yet they were both blinde: and neither Eve herſelf did conſider her own faults, as ſhe ſhould, nor Adam Eves faults; but immediately ſo ſoon as Adam had eaten, Geneſ. 3.7. *The eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked.* For their nakednes came by Adams ſinne, and not by Eves; the ſame ſinne of hers and his was not the ſame: neither Adam, nor we, nor ſhe herſelf by her ſinnes were bare and naked of goodnes, or had loſt *Bonum naturæ*, but onely *gratiæ perſonalis*: but when once he had ſinned; he, ſhe, and we were all naked, our natures corrupt and to be aſhamed of; and both of them knew it. *Their eyes opened themſelves*; ſo Tremellius hath it, differing from the Hebrew and the Septuagint. The truth is, ſhe ſinned the ſame ſinne twice; for ſhe ate firſt by herſelf, and then her eyes were not opened. *Neither was ſhe ſpoiled of originall juſtice* (ſaith Franciſcus Aretinus) *as it was gratia gratis data, nor did ſhe feel the motions of concupiſcence, or knew her own nakednes, till Adam had ſinned. For if ſhe had been deprived of grace ſo ſoon as ſhe ſinned, ſhe ſhould have been aſhamed of her nakednes; neither durſt ſhe to have gone naked to her huſband, but for modeſtie would have ſought ſome covering, or fled into corners.* So farre Aretinus, or Cornelius à Lapide who citeth him. But after this her eating and this her ſinne, ſhe cometh to her huſband, and offereth him ſome to eat, and eateth with him the ſecond time; and perchance began to eat the ſecond time ere he ate once, and

ſuffered him to ſee her eat. Sure I am, the Hebrew runneth thus, *She did eat, and gave alſo unto her huſband with her, and he did eat*: but the 70 ſay of Eve firſt, Ἔφαγε καὶ ἔδωκε καὶ τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς μετὰ αὐτῆς, καὶ ἔφαγον. where they are peremptorie, that Adam and Eve, or rather Eve and Adam ate both together. And Vatablus well expoundeth the SECVM, *id eſt, vt unà cum ipſa ederet*: and the proof is pertinent enough, though we do not reade with the Septuagint, *They did eat*, but with the Hebrew, He *did eat*, namely, with her, or, after he had ſeen her eat. The ſumme is, ſhe ate firſt, ſhe ate again with him, ſhe ſinned the ſame ſinne. And further, though ſhe ſinned the ſame ſinne the third time, in his eating and by it, aſwell as we did, who alſo were in him *ratione principii*; yet was it not her ſinne, but his ſinne that overthrew both him, her, and us: and in this ſenſe we may truly ſay, ſhe ſinned not the ſame ſinne with Adam. So much for the firſt queſtion. It cometh ſecondarilie to be enquired, *Whether Adams or Eves ſinne was the greater.*

5. To ſay that no ſinne is greater then other, is one of the groſſeſt errors that have been. Me thinks a Stoick ſhould be aſhamed to ſay, that Nero, Heliogabalus, and the grand Epicure ſinned not worſe, then Cato the Utican, Ariſtides the Juſt, or Zeno the Cittien of Cyprus, the great upholder of their own ſect: or that unmatchable Titus the Emperour, who lamented the day in which he did not good to ſome man, was no better then Timon *the Man-hater*. No other Philoſophers ever joyned hands with them in that folly. * *This of the equalitie of ſinnes, the Stoicks onely have dared to diſpute; for they did ſo againſt all the ſenſe, feeling, and opinion of mankinde,* ſaith S. Auguſtin. Yet Jovinian ſided with them; but S. Hierom confuted him, * *Which opinion of theirs in that Jovinian, who in this tenent was a Stoick, but in purſuing and defending pleaſures an Epicure, out of the ſacred Scriptures thou haſt moſt clearely convinced,* as S. Auguſtine in the ſame place teſtifieth of S. Hierom, to S. Hierom. The ſame in effect ſaith S. Hierom himſelf of himſelf, againſt Jovinian. † *We have cruſht both by common ſenſe and by divine Scripture the error of Jovinian, who would prove that there is no difference between juſt and juſt, a ſinner and a ſinner; and alſo the old opinion of Zeno.* And indeed, ſo he did in the ſame book, both by anſwering all Jovinians objections, and overlaying him with ſound proofs. I omit whatſoever S. Hierom hath laborioufly, acutely, and truly collected againſt the Stoicall equalitie of ſinnes, and againſt Jovinians wilde inferences. Let him that thirſteth, have recourſe to the fountain, in the ſaid ſecond book of S. Hierom againſt Jovinian: *Fons vincet ſitientem.* Yet ſuffer me to caſt my mite into the Treaſurie. Firſt, *Elenctice*, upon the by, then *Didactice*, on the main. Concerning the firſt; unto one of the witleſſe poſitions of Jovinian, viz. † *We love equally all our*

* *Hoc de parilitate peccatorum ſoli Stoici auſi ſunt diſputare; nam ſic fecerunt contra omnem ſenſum generis humani.* Aug. Epiſt. 29. Ad Hieronymum.

* *Quam eorum vanitatem, in Joviniano illo, qui in hac ſententia Stoicus erat, in aucupandis autem & defenſandis voluptatibus Epicurus, de Scripturis Sanctis diluciditſimè conviciſti.*

† *Nullam inter juſtum & juſtum, peccatorem & peccatorem eſſe diſtantiam; veterémq; Zenonis ſententiam tam communi ſenſu quàm divinâ lectione contrivimus* Hieron. Cont. Jovin. lib. 2.

our members, neither do we preferre the eye before the finger, nor the finger before the eare; by which he would inferre a parilitie of ſinnes, (beſides what S. Hierom excellently anſwereth) I can not chuſe but oppoſe what Moſes ſaith, Deuteron.32.10. *God kept the Iſraelites as the apple of his eye*, it being more guarded with the double coverlids of skins and hairs, and more curiouſly then any other outward part: which proverbiall ſimilitude, being alſo taken up both by David, Pſal.17.8. and by the Prophet Zecharie 2.8. ſignificantly intimateth, that one part of the body is more tender to us then any other. Neither needed there ſuch exact retaliation as is required Exod.21.24. *Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot*, if all members were of like worth: for a tooth might have been pluckt out for an eye, and the foot might have ſtood for the hand. Yea, whatſoever Jovinian opineth, or rather raveth, Dives being in torment had more regard to the cooling of his tongue, Luk. 16.24. then to the tip of his eare. *Where ſinne is, there is puniſhment alſo*, ſaith S. Chryſoſtom; *and Dives his tongue ſpake many proud things*, ſaith he: *and Dives was full of loquacitie*, as the Interlineary Gloſſe obſerveth even from his very ſpeech to Abraham: and perchance his tongue was moſt tortured, as having been moſt delighted and addulced with his daily delicious fare. If any of Zeno or Jovinian his partiſans will not beleeve, that one bodily member is better then an other, I could wiſh it might be beaten into them, and that they might endure ſound raps or blows on their heads, which any other man, yea naturall fools, by naturall inſtinct would rather beare off upon the arms, as objecting unto danger the member of leſſe worth, to ſave and defend the part more principall; which hourely experience ratifieth. I paſſe by all other his objections, becauſe I have ſtood too long on this, and I come to the main Queſtion, *Whether all ſinnes are equall*. The anſwer is plainly negative. Reaſons are theſe. Firſt, diverſitie of ſacrifices prove the inequalitie of offences, the greater offence being uſually expiated with the moſt coſtly ſacrifice. The ſinne of the Prieſt was, in the eſtimate of God, as the ſinne of the whole congregation, and the offering of his ſinne was *a young bullock without blemiſh*, Levit.4.3. If a Magiſtrate ſinned, he was to offer *a kid of the goats, a male without blemiſh*, verſ.23. If an ordinarie man offended, *a female* ſerved the turn, verſ.28. and 32. whether it were of goats or lambes. Where the beſt, greateſt, and coſtlieſt of oblations doth not prove, that the eſtate, or the perſon of the Prieſt was better and more noble then the eſtate or perſon of the King, or ſupreme Civill Magiſtrate, (which the Papiſts impertinently would prove from thence) but the Prieſts greater ſacrifice evinceth his ſinne to be greater, by reaſon of his greater knowledge. *For the Prieſts lips ſhould keep knowledge,*

*Omnia membra æqualiter diligimus, nec oculum præponimus digito, nec digitum auriculæ.

and they ſhould ſeek the Law at his mouth; for he is the Meſſenger of the Lord of hoſts, Malachi 2.7. A ſecond Reaſon may be this: Greater puniſhments, both criminall and capitall, are ordained by the Law, for ſome people more then for others: But this can not be juſtly appointed, unleſſe there be degrees of ſinne: Therefore ſinnes are not equall. Concerning the *Major*, view it evinced in theſe inſtances: *He that ſtealeth a man, ſhall die*, Exod.21.16. *If he ſteal an ox, or a ſheep, he ſhall reſtore five oxen for an ox, and foure ſheep for a ſheep*, Exod.22.1. He that kills a man unwillingly, ſhall be protected, Exod.21.13. if willingly, the very Sanctuarie, at the horns of the Altar, ſhall not ſave him; he ſhall die, verſ.14. The adulterie of common people was puniſhed with common death, Levit.20.10. But *the daughter of any Prieſt, if ſhe profane her ſelf by playing the whore, ſhe profaneth her father: ſhe ſhall be burnt with fire*, Levit.21.9. that is, ſhe ſhall be burnt alive. The *Minor* is proved, becauſe God is juſt, *and rewardeth every man according to his works*, Revel. 22.12. Thirdly, the Scripture ſaith ſome are more wicked then others, Jerem.3.11. *The back-ſliding Iſrael hath juſtified her ſelf more then treacherous Judah. Aholibah was more corrupt in her inordinate love then Aholah*, Ezek.23.11. And ſome ſhal have *ſorer puniſhment* then others Heb.10.29. There is a ſin remiſſible, & a ſin irremiſſible, Matth.12.31. Tyre and Sidon were more inclining to repentance, then Chorazin and Bethſaida, Matth.11.21. Accordingly, *It ſhall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom, then for them*, verſ.24. There are ſome ſinnes of infirmitie, ſome *of preſumption, and great tranſgreſſions*, Pſal.19.13. *Reward Babylon even as ſhe rewarded you, and double unto her double, according to her works: in the cup which ſhe hath filled, fill to her double. How much ſhe hath glorified her ſelf, and lived deliciouſly, ſo much torment and ſorrow give her*, Revel.18.6,7. Not, *double aſmuch as ſhe hath deſerved*; that were injuſtice; but, *double aſmuch as others drink of the wrath of God. The proſelyte of the Phariſees is twofold more the childe of hell then themſelves*, Matth.23.15. and ſome *ſhall receive greater damnation*, verſ.14. Geneſ.4.15. *Vengeance ſhall be taken ſeven-fold on him who ſlayeth Cain:* Not ſeven-fold more then ſuch a deed as murder deſerveth, but ſeven-fold more then is taken on ſome other men; perchance, ſeven-fold more then was taken on Cain himſelf. For though it be a greater ſinne to kill an innocent, then a bloud-guilty wretch or murderer; and more offenſive to ſlay a brother then one of leſſe kindred, or acquaintance, (which may ſeem to be the caſe between Cain and Abel on the one ſide, and Cain and his murderer on the other ſide) yet if we conſider, that God after an eſpeciall manner forbad any man to kill Cain, that God ordained life as a puniſhment to Cain, that *to kill Cain had been a courteſie*, ſaith Hierom, that Cain was to live to be a terrifying example

example to all murderers. Laſtly, if we remember, that to deterre all men from the murder of Cain, God ſet a notorious mark upon him, ſuch a one as never any untill this day had the like, by reaſon of the extraordinarines thereof; whether it were a brand or ſtamp in his forehead, or that the earth quaked under him whereſoever he went, or a preternaturall and unuſuall ſhaking of his head, or dreadfull tremors, or convulſions over all his body; of which the particular is as uncertain, as the generall can not be doubted of, namely, that unto his terrors of conſcience, and a vagrant unſetled minde, ſome outward evident mark was annexed, diſtinguiſhing him from other men, and in a ſort forbidding any to murder him: I ſay, he that now ſhould have killed Cain, might juſtly ſeven-fold deſerve Cains puniſhment, and an other may rightfully incurre puniſhment ſeventy times ſeven-fold, as it is, if not in truth, yet at the leaſt in the ſwaſive of Lamech to his wives, Geneſ. 4. 24. There is *a mote*, and there is *a beam*, Matth. 7. 3. This beam may be ſawed into many boards or rafters; and there is no vertue nor vice but hath its latitude and degrees partaking of *majus* and *minus*. There are *funiculi vanitatis*, Eſai. 5. 18. *cords of vanity*. There are *funes peccatorum*, *ropes of ſinnes*, Proverb. 5. 22. And there are *funes plauſtri*, as Vatablus rendereth it, according to the Hebrew, *cart-ropes* or *vinculum plauſtri*, according to the Vulgat, *the wain-rope*, Eſai 5. 18. differencing ſinnes, and being indebted to divers kindes of puniſhments. Every ſinne cauſeth a blot on the ſoul: the greater ſinne, the greater blot. A frequent ſinner is compared to *a ſpotted leopard*, Jerem. 13. 23. and ſome notorious ſinners are called *ſpots* in the abſtract, Jude, verſ. 12. More teſtimonies I could heap, but the point is cleared, and the enquiry, *Wheter Adam or Eve ſinned moſt*, is yet unanſwered.

6. And here both ancient and modern Divines do much varie. * Chryſoſtom ſaith expreſly, *Eve ſinned more then Adam:* and * elſewhere to this effect, *Eve was more puniſhed then Adam: but the puniſhment is anſwerable to the fault.* Therefore her ſinne was greater. Rupert followeth him, * *The woman is puniſhed by a threefold puniſhment, becauſe her ſinne was three times greater then Adams.* Hugo and Lombard, untruly ſuppoſing, that Eve onely beleeved the Serpents words promiſing them *to be like unto God*, do rather think Eve ſinned moſt. The Shoolmen by troups follow them. Cajetan is dubious: commenting on Aquinas he would not differ from his Maſter, the great Summiſt, but condemneth the woman more then the man; yet expounding the third of Genſis, he brings five reaſons to excuſe Eve more then Adam. S. Aug. is by both ſides, ſometimes aſcribing more fault to the man then to the woman, ſometimes to the woman rather then to the man: and * twice he ſeemeth to hold, *That they ſinned equally*. On the other ſide,

*Chryſ. Hom. 7. ad Pop. Ant.

*In Rom. Homil. 25. in Morali.

**Triplici pœnâ mulier punitur, quia triplo majus peccatum fuit ejus quàm Adami.* Rup. in Gen. lib. 3. cap. 22.

*De Gen. ad. lit. 11. 35. & De Civit. 14 11:

*Ambroſe ſaith, *Adams ſinne was greater.* And again,* *Eve ſinned more by unſtablenes of minde then by perverſenes.* Iſdore ſaith, * *It is more hainous to ſinne of ſet purpoſe, as Adam; then out of ignorance, as Eve.* This point needing to be diſtinguiſhed upon, Aquine telleth us, *The greatnes of a ſinne is two wayes conſidered; either ex ipſa ſpecie peccati, from the eſpeciall kinde of the ſinne, or according to the circumſtances of place or perſon: and he reſolveth thus;* * *In regard of the kinde of ſinne, the ſinne of them both is ſaid to be equall. Pride was in both: but if we look ad ſpeciem ſuperbiæ, Eve ſinned more, for theſe three regards; She was more proud then the man: She not onely ſinned her ſelf, but made her husband ſinne: Thirdly, Adams ſinne was leſſened by the love he bore unto his wife. Which laſt reaſon is grounded on the words of S. Auguſtine,* * *Adam ſinned not being overcome by carnall concupiſcence, but being conſtrained by ſome friendly affection; by which it cometh often to paſſe that God is offended, leſt a friend ſhould be offended.* Yea the ſame S. Auguſtine is cited thus, * *After the ſeduced woman had eaten, and had given him that they ſhould eat together, he was loth to grieve her whom he thought ready to pine away without his comfort, and altogether to die being eſtranged from him.* Laſtly, Aquine ſaith, *If we weigh the condition of both perſons, the mans ſinne was greater, becauſe he was perfecter then the woman.* So Aquine 2. 2. Quæſt. 163. Art. 4.

7. Scotus thus opineth, *Becauſe Adam was more circumſpect, more noble, more ſtrong to reſiſt; therefore by accident his ſinne was more great:** *Yet formally, in it ſelf, and preciſely, the ſinne of Eve was greater.* But the learned Eſtius, on the ſame diſtinction, Paragraphe 7, thus, *The greatnes of ſinne cometh many wayes; principally from the object and the end, then from the circumſtances either of the perſon or the intent of him, or of the frequencie of the act, or the greatnes of harm that cometh by the ſinne, or of the ignorance or infirmitie or induſtrie of the perſon. If we lay Adams and Eves ſinne in the ballance, reſpecting the object and the end, it weighed alike; both of them beleeved the Serpent, both would be like God, both ate of the fruit forbidden, both excuſed their faults: but weigh the circumſtances* (ſaith he) *the mans ſinne was ſimply greater. Firſt, he had more power to reſiſt. Secondly, he dealt with a leſſe ſubtile enemy, a ſimple woman; but ſhe had to do with an evill Angel, of an higher nature then herſelf. Thirdly, he had the precept from God himſelf; ſhe but from her husband. Fourthly, he was to be head over his wife, and not ſhe over him; and he was to reduce her into the right way, when ſhe ſtrayed. Fifthly, his excuſe caſt part of the fault, as it were, upon God himſelf. Sixthly, indeed he was worſe puniſhed, and ſo ſaith Auguſtine truly. Seventhly, the better things are the worſt in their corruption: The beſt wine turnes to the ſharpeſt vineger, the beſt of government, a Monarchie, proves the worſt, if it degenerate*

*Ambr. *De Inſtit. virginis* cap. 4.
**Eva magis mobilitate animi, quàm pravitate peccavit.* Comment. in Luc. 4. 38.
**Gravius eſt de induſtria peccare, quo modo peccavit Adam, quàm ignorantiâ, quo modo peccavit Eva.* Iſid. *De Summo Bono* 2. 17.
**Quantum ad genus peccati, utriuſq; peccatum æquale dicitur.*

**Adam non carnali concupiſcentiâ victus, ſed amicabili quâdam compulſus benevolentiâ, quâ plerunq; fit ut offendatur Deus, ne offendatur amicus, peccavit.* De Gen. ad lit. 12. ult.
**Poſtquam mulier ſeducta manducavit, eiq; dedit ut ſimul ederent, noluit eam contriſtari, quam credebat ſine ſuo ſolatio contabeſcere, & à ſe alienatam omnino interire.*
**Formaliter tamen, per ſe merè, & præciſè in ſe, peccatum Evæ fuit gravius.* Scotus in 2. Sent. diſt. 27. quæſt. 2.

nerate into a Tyranny. But the man exceeded the woman as well in naturals as in gratuitous. So farre in effect Estius.

Bellarmine compareth their acts and persons together, and concludeth, that both in regard of acts and persons, Eve sinned least, Adam worst. His observations are not onely passable, but commendable, save in two things. First, that he makes the excusation of their sinne, to be one act of the seven in Adam and Eves sinne; when as in truth, their excuse was no part or branch of their first sinne, but a distinct and severall sinne by it self. For having ended their first sinne, they were ashamed, and had time to gather figleaves and sew them, and make themselves aprons, or things to gird about them: after this, they heard God speak, and hid themselves: after this, was their examination *de facto*, and their confession: after all this, begins Adams excuse, Genes. 3. 12. and Eves, vers. 13. The diversitie of these severall actions, and the distance of time interceding, shew it was no part of their first sinne to excuse themselves. An other especiall sinne it was, aggravating the former: and in this sinne Adam sinned worst, as accusing God, indirectly, for giving such an helper to him as had hurt him. Who will see things more at large, let him consult with Estius and Bellarmine, unto whom, for the main, I do subscribe; though I make the last part, and act of Adam and Eves sinne, to be their reall orall manducation. The second scape of Bellarmine is, that whereas in true Divinitie, the fall of mankinde is a consequent of our first parents transgression; Bellarmine makes it one of the seven acts of their sinne, confounding the cause with the effect, and not sufficiently distinguishing the fault from the punishment. May I adde these things: Out of the words of Scotus, I thus argue, Originall justice was given to Adam, as to the worthier, abler, and wiser person; yea, it was so given, that if he lost it, he was to lose it for himself and his whole posteritie. But it was not so given, or infeoffeed to Eve; therefore since he failed, when the trust of the whole World was reposed on him, his sinne must needs be much more hainous then hers. If the first sinning Angel was the greatest delinquent, though none of the other Angels sinned in him, but each of himself, by his own proper will; then Adam certainly sinned worse, who bare our persons, and being the Referre, to whom our blessednesse or cursednesse was intrusted, drew us all into unhappinesse. For *the woman was but the incompleat principle of offending*, saith Gorran: But *by Adams first sinne we lost the good of nature, *which was to be transmitted by the spring of nature*, saith Aquine. By Adams other transgressions the good of personall grace was diminished, and might be recovered, but the Naturall good traducible could not be regained by any repentance. The greatnesse of Adams sinne appeared in that he might so easily have kept the precept,

Bell. *De Amis. Gratiæ & Statu Peccati* 3.9.

* *Bonum naturæ, quod erat per originem naturæ traducendum.* Aquin in Rom. 5. Lect. 3.

*Quanta erat iniquitas in peccando, vbi tanta erat non peccandi facilitas! Aug. De Civit. 14. 15.

*How great iniquitie was there in ſinning, where ſuch facilitie was of not ſinning! ſaith Auguſtine. Indeed to eat of the apple ſeemeth a ſmall matter to the carnall eyes of men, but in the leaſt thing to be diſobedient is not the leaſt offence; for as *to obey is better then ſacrifice*, ſo *diſobedience is as the ſinne of witchcraft, and tranſgreſſion is wickedneſſe and idolatrie*, 1 Sam. 15. 22, 23. Naaman, who would have performed a greater matter, ſhould much more willingly have been ruled by the Prophet in a trifle: it was the well-poiſed argument of his ſervants, 2. Kings 5. 13. and his correſpondent obedience was juſtly rewarded with health. But Adam, beſides the ſmallnes of the matter it ſelf, erred groſly in the manner: for God did not appoint him any hard work, no laborious task to perform. Omiſſion is of an eaſie and pliable nature: more facile it is for one not to waſh a thouſand times, then to waſh once. Now, the precept unto Adam was inhibitive, meerly of omiſſion, negation, or preterition, eaſier to be kept then broken; and therefore to break it was a ſinne of an high hand, a preſumptuous ſinne, which may be aggravated in him by this circumſtance, that he received the reſtraint from God, which Eve did not. They who think otherwiſe of Adams ſinne, do judge of it as the common people do of the fixed ſtarres, who imagine them to be no greater then a candle. But if you truly take the height and breadth of Adams ſinne, it will be found, as the ſtarres in heaven, of greatnes almoſt incredible; divers of them, in their ſeverall ſtations, being greater then the whole earth. Perhaps one of the reaſons, why the Apoſtle, Heb. 11. nameth not Adam among the old faithfull Heroes, was this, becauſe he committed a greater ſinne then any of them. For his offence hath been the cauſe of death, of ſicknes, of all puniſhments inflicted on men, in this life or in the life to come. Not Satans temptation, not Eves ſeduction, but Adams wilfull diſobedience coſt the bloud of the Sonne of God. And all the deſpighteous ſinnes of mankinde, wherewith the Father bleſſed for ever, the gracious Redeemer, and the ſanctifying Spirit are grieved, and do as it were grone under, and at which the holy Angels are offended, and do in their ſort mourn, proceed originally from that ſinne of Adam, and but for that had never been. Therefore was his offence greater then Eves. Moreover, God firſt ſummoned Adam, though Eve ſinned firſt, and queſtioned Adam particularly for that ſin, and not Eve, Geneſ. 3.9. and at the cenſure (perchance with an emphaſis) God ſaid unto Adam (which he did not unto Eve) Gen. 3. 17. *Thou haſt eaten of the tree of which I commanded* THEE, *ſaying*, THOU *ſhalt not eat of it*; and denounced more puniſhments againſt him then againſt Eve, and worſe; and this among the reſt, ratifying the former threatning, *Duſt thou art, and unto duſt ſhalt thou return*; inflicting death on Adam, on Eve, on us

for

for Adams ſinne, and not for Eves. Laſtly, the Spirit of God ſeemeth to derive the fault from Eve unto the Serpent, 2 Cor. 11.3. ὁ ὄφις Εὕαν ἐξηπάτησεν ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτοῦ, *in aſtutia ſua*: αὐτοῦ, not αὐτῆς, *in his craft*, and her ſimplicitie, *he deceived her*. Now let Scotus leſſen Adams offence as much as he can, let him ſay, * *The eating of the forbidden tree was no ſinne, but becauſe it was forbidden; and he might well and lawfully have eaten of it, if he had not been forbidden; and he erred not againſt any naturall law, but a law poſitive, and in a thing otherwiſe indifferent.* I anſwer, The ſame and more excuſes are for Eve. Again, in regard of its ſpreading infection, and the myriads of evils thence enſuing, & the bleſſed eſtate of many millions by him betrayed to the lake of fire and brimſtone, which never ſhall be quenched, contrarie to the truſt to him concredited, I ſhall alwayes think Adams ſinne the worſt of all ſinnes that ever any one of mankinde committed, not excepting the ſinne of Judas, or the ſinne againſt the Holy Ghoſt. For theſe hurt but few, and if they were worſe intenſively, they were not ſo bad extenſively: and therefore I muſt account it one of Scotus his errours, when he ſaith, * *The greateſt paniſhment was not due to Adams ſinne; yea, if he had been damned himſelf for that ſinne, he had not been ſo grievouſly puniſhed for it as many others.* The ancient Fathers did not ſo lightly prize the firſt ſinne of Adam. Auguſtine ſaith, * *A Precept ſo light for keeping, ſo ſhort for remembring, was broken by ſo much greater injuſtice, by how much more eaſily it might have been kept.* And though Scotus holdeth, it did conſiſt in immoderate love and friendſhip to his wife; yet I ſay, his uxorioufneſſe was but a branch, a piece, a quarter, a rafter of that beam, a part, a member of that body of ſinne. * Tertull. doubts not to call Adams ſinne, *Hereſie*, and Adam, *a very rude Heretick*. Ambroſe on Rom. 5.14. * *Adams ſinne is not farre from idolatrie.* And in his 33. Epiſtle to his ſiſter Marcellina, he findes *infidelitie* in Adam, for not beleeving in Gods word. Auguſtine in his Enchirid. chap. 45. imputes unto him *Pride*, & *Sacriledge*; for it was ſacrilegious pride, to impropriate & uſurp the fruit ſeparated from common uſe. He was a murderer, deſtroying himſelf & all mankinde: guiltie he was of ſpirituall fornication committed with the Serpent. He may be further charged for felony, in ſtealing the fruit which was not his. Rupertus on Geneſ. 2. 39. ſaith, *Ingratitude was his firſt ſinne. He fell by covetouſnes*, ſaith Auguſtine; *for God could not ſuffice him; and having much more then he needed, yet he would need more then he had.* Any one may blot him with curioſitie, for ſeeking to know what did him hurt. His gluttony was manifeſt, in looſing the reins to his beaſtly appetite. His want of naturall affection toward his poſteritie by him decaying, is juſtly blameable. Brentius hath one newfangle on John 8; *That Adams ſinne was rebellion or defection, becauſe*

* *Eſus ligni vetiti non fuit peccatum, niſi quia prohibitum.*

* *Peccato Adæ non debebatur maxima pœna; imò ſi ipſe damnatus fuiſſet pro illo peccato, non fuiſſet ità graviter puuitus pro iſto peccato, ſicut multi alii.*

* *Tam leve præceptum ad obſervandum, tam breve ad memoriâ retinendum, tantò majore injuſtitiâ violatum eſt, quantò faciliori poſſit obſervantiâ cuſtodiri.* De Civit. 14. 12.

* Tert. Cont. Marcion. lib. 2.

* *Peccatum Adæ non longè eſt ab idololatria.*

*Quanta erat iniquitas in peccando, vbi tanta erat non peccandi facilitas! Aug. De Civit. 14. 15.

**How great iniquitie was there in ſinning, where ſuch facilitie was of not ſinning!* ſaith Auguſtine. Indeed to eat of the apple ſeemeth a ſmall matter to the carnall eyes of men, but in the leaſt thing to be diſobedient is not the leaſt offence; for as *to obey is better then ſacrifice*, ſo *diſobedience is as the ſinne of witchcraft, and tranſgreſſion is wickedneſſe and idolatrie*, 1 Sam. 15. 22, 23. Naaman, who would have performed a greater matter, ſhould much more willingly have been ruled by the Prophet in a trifle: it was the well-poiſed argument of his ſervants, 2. Kings 5. 13. and his correſpondent obedience was juſtly rewarded with health. But Adam, beſides the ſmallnes of the matter it ſelf, erred groſly in the manner: for God did not appoint him any hard work, no laborious task to perform. Omiſſion is of an eaſie and pliable nature: more facile it is for one not to waſh a thouſand times, then to waſh once. Now, the precept unto Adam was inhibitive, meerly of omiſſion, negation, or preterition, eaſier to be kept then broken; and therefore to break it was a ſinne of an high hand, a preſumptuous ſinne, which may be aggravated in him by this circumſtance, that he received the reſtraint from God, which Eve did not. They who think otherwiſe of Adams ſinne, do judge of it as the common people do of the fixed ſtarres, who imagine them to be no greater then a candle. But if you truly take the height and breadth of Adams ſinne, it will be found, as the ſtarres in heaven, of greatnes almoſt incredible; divers of them, in their ſeverall ſtations, being greater then the whole earth. Perhaps one of the reaſons, why the Apoſtle, Heb. 11. nameth not Adam among the old faithfull Heroes, was this, becauſe he committed a greater ſinne then any of them. For his offence hath been the cauſe of death, of ſicknes, of all puniſhments inflicted on men, in this life or in the life to come. Not Satans temptation, not Eves ſeduction, but Adams wilfull diſobedience coſt the bloud of the Sonne of God. And all the deſpighteous ſinnes of mankinde, wherewith the Father bleſſed for ever, the gracious Redeemer, and the ſanctifying Spirit are grieved, and do as it were grone under, and at which the holy Angels are offended, and do in their ſort mourn, proceed originally from that ſinne of Adam, and but for that had never been. Therefore was his offence greater then Eves. Moreover, God firſt ſummoned Adam, though Eve ſinned firſt, and queſtioned Adam particularly for that ſin, and not Eve, Geneſ. 3.9. and at the cenſure (perchance with an emphaſis) God ſaid unto Adam (which he did not unto Eve) Gen. 3. 17. *Thou haſt eaten of the tree of which I commanded THEE, ſaying, THOU ſhalt not eat of it*; and denounced more puniſhments againſt him then againſt Eve, and worſe; and this among the reſt, ratifying the former threatning, *Duſt thou art, and unto duſt ſhalt thou return*; inflicting death on Adam, on Eve, on us

for

for Adams ſinne, and not for Eves. Laſtly, the Spirit of God ſeemeth to derive the fault from Eve unto the Serpent, 2 Cor. 11.3. ὁ ὄφις Εὐαν ἐξηπάτησεν ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτοῦ, *in aſtutia ſua*: αὐτοῦ, not αὐτῆς, *in his craft*, and her ſimplicitie, *he deceived her*. Now let Scotus leſſen Adams offence as much as he can, let him ſay, * *The eating of the forbidden tree was no ſinne, but becauſe it was forbidden; and he might well and lawfully have eaten of it, if he had not been forbidden; and he erred not againſt any naturall law, but a law poſitive, and in a thing otherwiſe indifferent.* I anſwer, The ſame and more excuſes are for Eve. Again, in regard of its ſpreading infection, and the myriads of evils thence enſuing, & the bleſſed eſtate of many millions by him betrayed to the lake of fire and brimſtone, which never ſhall be quenched, contrarie to the truſt to him concredited, I ſhall alwayes think Adams ſinne the worſt of all ſinnes that ever any one of mankinde committed, not excepting the ſinne of Judas, or the ſinne againſt the Holy Ghoſt. For theſe hurt but few, and if they were worſe intenſively, they were not ſo bad extenſively: and therefore I muſt account it one of Scotus his errours, when he ſaith, * *The greateſt puniſhment was not due to Adams ſinne; yea, if he had been damned himſelf for that ſinne, he had not been ſo grievouſly puniſhed for it as many others.* The ancient Fathers did not ſo lightly prize the firſt ſinne of Adam. Auguſtine ſaith, * *A Precept ſo light for keeping, ſo ſhort for remembring, was broken by ſo much greater injuſtice, by how much more eaſily it might have been kept.* And though Scotus holdeth, it did conſiſt in immoderate love and friendſhip to his wife; yet I ſay, his uxoriouſneſſe was but a branch, a piece, a quarter, a rafter of that beam, a part, a member of that body of ſinne. * Tertull. doubts not to call Adams ſinne, *Hereſie*, and Adam, *a very rude Heretick*. Ambroſe on Rom. 5.14. * *Adams ſinne is not farre from idolatrie.* And in his 33. Epiſtle to his ſiſter Marcellina, he findes *infidelitie* in Adam, for not beleeving in Gods word. Auguſtine in his Enchirid. chap. 45. imputes unto him *Pride, & Sacriledge*; for it was ſacrilegious pride, to impropriate & uſurp the fruit ſeparated from common uſe. He was a murderer, deſtroying himſelf & all mankinde: guiltie he was of ſpirituall fornication committed with the Serpent. He may be further charged for felony, in ſtealing the fruit which was not his. Rupertus on Geneſ. 2. 39. ſaith, *Ingratitude was his firſt ſinne. He fell by covetouſnes*, ſaith Auguſtine; *for God could not ſuffice him; and having much more then he needed, yet he would need more then he had.* Any one may blot him with curioſitie, for ſeeking to know what did him hurt. His gluttony was manifeſt, in looſing the reins to his beaſtly appetite. His want of naturall affection toward his poſteritie by him decaying, is juſtly blameable. Brentius hath one new-fangle on John 8; *That Adams ſinne was rebellion or defection, becauſe*

*Eſus ligni vetiti non fuit peccatum, niſi quia prohibitum.

*Peccato Adæ non debebatur maxima pœna; imò ſi ipſe damnatus fuiſſet pro illo peccato, non fuiſſet ità graviter punitus pro iſto peccato, ſicut multi alii.

* Tam leve præceptum ad obſervandum, tam breve ad memoriâ retinendum, tantò majore injuſtitiâ violatum eſt, quantò faciliori poſſit obſervantiâ cuſtodiri. De Civit. 14. 12.

*Tert. Cont. Marcion. lib. 2.

*Peccatum Adæ non longè eſt ab idololatria.

cauſe he would not be ſubject to Chriſt. He might rather have accuſed him for contempt of his Creator, for his folly in venturing the loſſe of heaven for an apple, for his credulity in beleeving Satan before God. The Apoſtle chargeth him with *diſobedience*, Rom. 5. 19. Bellarmine ſaith, * *The firſt act of pride is to refuſe to be ſubject to the command and precepts of another, which properly is called diſobedience: as contrarily, the firſt of humility is to be ſubject to another.* But Scotus doth better ſet down the order of the acts of our will: * *There is commonly a double act of the will,* LIKING *and* DISLIKING;—*and every diſliking preſuppoſeth ſome liking: ---- and no diſliking is the firſt inordinate act of the will, becauſe it could not have a diſliking, but in regard or by vertue of ſome liking.* In this I preferre Scotus before Bellarmine and Eſtius, becauſe the firſt act of pride or diſobedience is ſelf-complacencie, from whence iſſueth the diſlike, or *nolle* of ſubjection; as in humilitie, the firſt act is *Velle placere alteri*, whence ariſeth the groundwork of obedience. Secondly, Auguſtine ſaith, * *They began in ſecret to be evil: the ill will preceded the ill work; ſelf-love was the bait; the Devil could not have caught Adam,* * *unleſs he had begun alreadie to be ſelf pleaſed: they were tickled with thoſe words,* YE SHALL BE LIKE GODS Gen. 3. 5 From whence I marvel Bellarmine obſerved not, that *Velle ſibi placere* is the firſt ſtep of pride, and therefore the *Nolle ſubjici* is the ſecond act, or act concomitant. Thirdly, * Bellarmine himſelf interfeering ſaith, *The pride of our parents began not from this act,* I VVILL NOT BE UNDER THE POVVER OF GOD, *but after the hearing of theſe words,* YE SHALL BE LIKE GODS, *they began to conſider within themſelves, it was a goodly thing not to depend of an other; and at the ſame time they began to be delighted with their own power, and to deſire it, and vehemently to pleaſe themſelves.* Here he maketh three or foure acts to beginne together, and maketh ſome ill act or acts precede this, *I will not be under the power of God.* Laſtly, * Bellarmine hath it thus, * *The firſt ill act in the ſinne of the man was pride, by which he loved to be in his own power rather then in Gods.* And he citeth Auguſtine in Enchirid. chap. 45. Therefore the beginning of Adams iniquitie conſiſted in a VELLE, rather then in a NOLLE. Now, though Scotus his Diſcourſe and Philoſophie ſideth thus farre with truth, that an evil *Nolle* neceſſarily preſuppoſeth an evil *Velle*, (which is expreſſely againſt the opinion of Bellarmine and Eſtius) yet it crawleth on lamely towards * Scotus his concluſion, *That Adam did firſt ſinne in inordinate love of friendſhip towards his wife* for I will place in Adam another *Velle*, a former *Velle*, a *malum Velle*, and a *pejus Velle* before his uxorioufneſſe. Auguſtine in his 21 Sermon upon Pſal. 118. (which we account the 119 Pſal.) ſaith thus, * *That man would be his own, that is the firſt and greateſt evil of diſobedience.* And * elſewhere he takes pride and diſobedience

* Actu primus ſuperbiæ eſt, velle ſubjici imperio & præceptis alterius, quæ proprie dicitur inobedientia. Bell. De Amiſſ. Gratiæ 3. 4.

* Eſt in communi duplex actus voluntatis, VELLE & NOLLE —& omne nolle præſupponit aliquod velle —& nullum nolle eſt primus actus deordinatus voluntatis, quia non poſſet habere nolle, niſi reſpectu, vel in virtute alicujus velle. Scot. in 2. Sent. diſt. 6. quæſt. 2.

* In occulto mali eſſe cæperunt. Aug. De Civit. 14. 13.

* Niſi jam ille ſibi placere cæpiſſet.

* Bellarm. ibid. cap. 5.

* Bell. De Amiſſ. Gratiæ 3. 9.

* Primus actus malus in peccato viri ſuperbia fuit, quâ in ſua potius eſſe, quàm in Dei poteſtate dilexit.

* Scot. Diſt. 22.

* Quòd homo ſuus eſſe voluit, id eſt inobedientiæ primum & maximum malum.

* De Civit. 14. 13. & de Gen. ad lit. 8. 14.

bedience for all one. Again,* *Man being lift up with pride, obeying the perſuaſion of the Serpent deſpiſed Gods precepts.* And,* *In the will of man there goes before ſome deſire of his own power, to be made diſobedient through pride.* Eves pride, out of doubt, aroſe from thoſe words, Geneſ. 3. 5. *Your eyes ſhall be opened, and ye ſhall be as Gods.* Where the hint was given to the *Velle*, before the *Nolle*; and the firſt motion was to the unlawfull love of himſelf. Now, what the Serpent ſaid to Eve, queſtionleſſe ſhe related to Adam. And her pride alſo might firſt ariſe from the ſaid fountain: and his uxoriouſneſſe followed thereupon; and the immoderate love of himſelf was before the immoderate love unto his wife. I ſay *queſtionles*, becauſe it is both true in it ſelf, and others yeeld unto it, and * S. Auguſtine obſerveth it, *What Adam received from God, he told to Eve; what Eve heard from Satan, ſhe told to Adam.* To conclude,* Auguſtine ſaith, *Adam and Eve were firſt turned from God to pleaſe themſelves, and thence and after that to grow cold and dull; that ſhe either beleeved the Serpent, or he preferd his wives will before the will of God.* Where he maketh both Adams and Eves ſinne to be the ſame inordinate love to themſelves; and this is againſt Scotus. Proſper in the 358 Sentence, picked out of Auguſtine, ſaith, concerning Adam, * *The firſt vice of the reaſonable ſoul is the will of doing thoſe things which the ſupreme and moſt intimate truth forbids.* Neither hath Scotus his argutation, rather then argumentation, his uſuall ſubtiltie in it.* *There is a twofold will: either that will by which one deſires a thing with the love of friendſhip, which is for himſelf or for the thing loved; or that will by which one deſires a thing with the love of profit, which is for another. The firſt ſinne of Adam was not out of an immoderate love of himſelf, as the firſt ſinne of Angels, neither could be; becauſe the Angels know themſelves firſt, by their own eſſence; but man knowes other things before himſelf.* For did not Adam know himſelf ere he knew Eve or Angels? or hath it any neceſſarie conſequence, if he knew her firſt, that therefore he muſt love her content firſt, rather then pleaſe himſelf? Yea, if he had a deſire to pleaſe her, might not this ariſe out of a deſire to pleaſe himſelf? Laſtly, did the Angels and Eve ſinne out of an immoderate deſire of love toward themſelves? Then how ſaith Scotus, that Adams firſt ſinne neither was, nor could be an immoderate and inordinate love of himſelf? What was in Eve, could and might have been and was in Adam. The diſcourſe of Aquinas in this point ſeemes more agreeable to Scripture, and Fathers, then that of Scotus. And this it is. That unto one ſinne many motions do concurre, amongſt which that is to be accounted the firſt ſinne, in which firſt of all, inordination, deviation, diſorder, or aberration from the Law is found. Now it is apparent, that exorbitancy or deordination is ſooner in the inward motion of the ſoul, then it is in the bodie; and among the

*Homo elatus ſuperbiâ, ſuaſioni Serpentis obediens præcepta Dei contempſit. Ep. 81. Ad Oroſium.

*Præcedit in voluntate hominis appetitus quidam propriæ poteſtatis, ut fiat inobediens per ſuperbiam. De peccat. Meri. & Rem. 2. 19.

*Aug. De Gen. ad lit. 11. 34.

*De Civit. 14. 13.

*Primum animæ rationalis vitium eſt, voluntas ea faciendi quæ vetat ſumma & intima veritas.

*Duplex eſt Velle: aut eſt Velle aliquid amore amicitiæ, qui eſt propter ſe, vel propter amatum; vel amore commodi, qui eſt propter aliud. Primum peccatum Adæ non fuit ex immoderato amore ſui, ſicut fuit primum peccatum Angeli, nec potuit eſſe; quia Angelus intelligit ſe primò, per ſuam eſſentiam; & homo intelligit alia priùs quàm ſe.

the interiour motions of the ſoul, the appetite is firſt moved toward the end it ſelf, then toward the means leading toward the end: and therefore there was the firſt ſinne of Adam, where was the firſt deſire of an unlawfull and diſordered end. The ſumme is, Man deſired an illicit ſeeming ſpirituall good; namely, to ſubſiſt of himſelf, as God doth. Which firſt act or motion of pride, or inward diſobedience, being all one with the firſt inclination to break the Law of God and to eat the forbidden fruit, and being accompanied with that chain of other evill motions & actions before mentioned, was conſummated by the outward diſobedience in the orall eating the food inhibited. And the time was ſo ſhort between the ſinfull *motus primo-primus* in the ſoul, and the various continued difformitie of other ebullitions, which were coherent and bound up in that unhappie knot of outward diſobedience, that we may ſafely ſay, it was one ſinne *aggregativè*; and every particular evill thought, act, or motion, from his fare-well given unto innocency, unto his plain down-fall; from the laſt of his inward obedience, unto his firſt outward diſobedience, compleat and ended, was a parcell or branch of that one great ſinne which was againſt that Law divine, Geneſ.2.17. As our Saviour ſaith, Matth.5.28. *Whoſoever looketh on a woman to luſt after her, hath committed adulterie with her already in his heart:* So, ſo ſoon as ever Adam looked on the apple to luſt after it, the firſt inward motion, tending to this luſt of pride or diſobedience, was averſe from the Law, though the externall treſpaſſe made the ſinne to be full, and the breach to be palpable and evident. And as it is but one conſummate adulterie, though divers evil thoughts, *& multæ moroſæ cogitationes, many wilde motions* concurre unto it: ſo may Adams ſinne be ſaid to be but one, though conſiſting of divers parts and branches, from the primative ſpirituall inclination of averſion, to the hindmoſt bodily formalitie, or cõſummation of his diſobedience.* Eſtius hath theſe arguments, to evidence that pride (which is unſeparably annexed to diſobedience) was the firſt ſinne of man. Firſt, our parents, Adam and Eve, were firſt tempted with the ſinne of pride, by theſe words, *Ye ſhall be like Gods*; therefore by that they fell firſt. Secondly, the Devil would draw man to perdition, by the ſame ſinne by which he fell: But he fell by pride, 1 Tim.3.6. Laſtly, Chriſt by humilitie and obedience recovered us; therefore Adam by pride and diſobedience hurt us. And this is Auguſtines reaſon, *De Civit.*14.13. If any man deſire more curioſities trenching upon this point, let him conſult with Doctor Eſtius, in the place above cited, who hath handled ſuch things *apertiſſimè & ſatiatiſſimè, moſt plainly and fully*, as Auguſtine ſaid of Ambroſe, againſt Julian the Pelagian.

Eſt.Diſt.22 Paragr.1.

And now at length I am come to that ſecond poſition which I re-

I resolved to unfold and handle, in giving answer unto the first Question; *How and why death was appointed unto us.* The first part of the answer is already handled, (& here I considered originall sinne principally, as it was acted by Adam) *That Adam for sinne was appointed to die.* The second now followeth, towit, *Adams sinne was propagated to us*; and so by just consequent, *We shall die for this sinne.* And first, concerning the propagation of his sinne, of originall sinne, as it was an emanation from Adam, and as it lodgeth and abideth in us.

ALmightie, and most Gracious Father, grant unto us, that we which fell by pride, may by humilitie and obedience be raised up, through Jesus Christ, our onely Advocate and Redeemer. Amen.

CHAP. V.

1. *Originall sinne is an obscure point. The errors of the Schoolmen concerning it. The oversight of Bellarmine.*

2. *Originall sinne described by its causes: Distinguished from Adams actuall sinne.*

3. *In what sense Adam had, and his posteritie hath originall sinne. We were in Adam. He stood for us* idealiter. *Every one of us would have done exactly as Adam did. We did sinne in Adam, and how.*

4. *Whether Christ was in Adam, and how.*

5. *We sinned not that sinne in Adam by imitation.*

6. *Adams sinne, as personall, was not imputed. Adam is saved. Adams actuall sinne, as it was ideall and representative, is imputed to us.*

1 COncerning originall sinne, though it be most true what S. Augustine saith, de Morib. Eccl. 1. 22, * *There is nothing to preach of more known, nothing to understand more hidden then originall sinne.* And, * *We ought to seek nothing beyond the root.* Yet let us search, till we finde this root. And since

* *Nihil est peccato originali ad prædicandum notius, nihil ad intelligendum secretius.*
* *Ultra radicem nihil quærere oportet.* De lib. Arbitrio 3. 17.

the Apoſtle hath broken the ground, and opened the way, let us joyfully follow ſo bleſſed a guide. S. Paul, Rom. 5. 12. --- hath a large Tractate of originall ſinne, as it is propagated unto us by Adam: and Rom. 6. he ſpeaketh of it, as it is in the Regenerate. The preſent queſtioned point hath nothing to do with this latter conſideration, and it is pertinently excluded from this diſcourſe. But of originall ſinne, as it is conveyed unto us by Adam, divers things muſt be explained. Firſt, you are to know, that the Schoolmen are blindly led in this point. You may ſee it at large *in Beatiſſimo* * *Whitakero*, (for even that title is given to him by the learned Albericus Gentilis, in the tenth Chapter of his Diſputation on the firſt Book of the Maccabees.) And certainly, none of late time hath ſo tripped them up as he hath done, in his canvaſſe of Stapleton. The errors of ſingular Schoolmen are various, too many to be here confuted ſeverally; yet not ſo many as are imagined. Holcot in his Queſtion, *Whether every ſin be imputable to the will*, proveth out of Auguſtines Book *De Hæreſibus*, Chap. 8. that ſome Hereticks have denied originall ſinne, or that there is any ſuch thing. But he reſolveth, *That the Church hath determined the opinion to be erroneous*. And Auguſtine, Gregorie, Bede, and all Authentick Doctors have ſpoken fully and expreſly hereof: *and I* (ſaith he) *preſuppoſe it as one Article of Faith*. Then cometh he to the diverſitie of opinions, *Some*, ſaith he, *have held, that originall ſinne is not culpa, but pœna, or obligatio ad pœnam. Anſelm and Lombard diſlike this*, ſaith he. And indeed * Lombard proveth ſoundly, both that according to this opinion originall ſinne is neither *culpa*, no, nor *pœna*; and by excellent arguments eſtabliſheth, that it is *culpa*. *Some* (ſaith Holcot) *who ſay it is culpa, hold it is nothing els but the actuall ſinne of our firſt parent imputed to us: and this Tenet Anſelm diſliketh*. But Anſelms diſlike hath not hindered Catharinus and Pighius from embracing that error: Yea Stapleton himſelf acknowledgeth three great errors in this by-path of Pighius. Firſt, That he makes originall ſinne no ſinne, but an obnoxietie to puniſhment. Secondly, That children want all ſinne, and yet are by him made ſinners. Thirdly, That he makes no inherent originall ſinne in every one. Whitaker addeth a fourth abſurdity, That he teacheth children are damned, who yet have no ſinne. I return to Holcot, who addeth, *Others ſay, Originall ſinne is the pure privation of juſtice originall, or injuſtice which is nothing in nature, but a pure privation and want of juſtice, in ſubjecto apto nato. Yet*, ſaith Holcot, (*as I have ſaid otherwhere*) *it appeareth not to me, that any ſuch pure privation is either originall or actuall ſinne*. At laſt, Holcot profeſſeth to follow Lombard, holding, that originall ſinne is an evill habit with which we are born, and which we contract from the beginning of our nativitie. This habit is concupiſcence, this concupiſcence is a

* Whitak. De Originali Peccato lib. 1. cap. 1.

* Lomb. 2. Sent. diſt. 30. lit. E & F.

is a vice, *quod parvulum habilem concupiſcere facit, adultum verò & concupiſcentem reddit*; and this he fathereth on Auguſtine. But this opinion is no better then the reſt, if by concupiſcence they mean (as they do) onely the ſenſuality, luſt, and brutiſh appetite of things ſenſitive. You ſhall ſee it further confuted, when I have diſcloſed the erronious doctrine, which Lombard and his partiſans hold, to uphold this, *That originall ſinne is the vice of concupiſcence.* * Lombard maintaineth that every one of our bodies were in Adam: and whereas it was before objected, That all fleſh which deſcended from Adam, could not be at once and together in him, becauſe it is farre greater then the body of Adam, in which there were not ſo many, as it were, motes of fleſh, as men, who have deſcended from him; Lombard anſwereth, *All fleſh was in him materially and cauſally, though not formally: and all that is in humane bodies naturally, deſcendeth from Adam, and in it ſelf is increaſed and multiplied, and this is that which ſhall ariſe at the Reſurrection: That no outward ſubſtance doth paſſe into that ſubſtance: That it is fomented by meats; but no meats are turned into that ſubſtance humane, which by propagation deſcended from Adam. For Adam tranſmitted a little of his ſubſtance into the bodies of his children, when he begat them; that is, a little MODICUM was divided from the maſſe of his ſubſtance, and thereof was the body of his ſonne formed, and by multiplication of it ſelf is increaſed, without the adjection of any outward thing. And of that Modicum being augmented, ſomewhat is ſeparated, whereby the bodies of poſterities are in the like ſort ſtill formed.* His proofs were eaſie to be anſwered: but there is a *veru*, or an *obeliſk* ſet on that opinion, in the margin, *Magiſter hic non approbatur.* And more at large, among the errors condemned in England and in Paris (for ſo go the words of the Preface) not in England and France, not alone in Oxford and Paris, but in both the Univerſities of England, and in that of Paris, you ſhall finde him forſaken in theſe opinions, pag. 985. 1 *That no externall thing paſſeth into the truth of humane nature.* 2 *That which deſcendeth from Adam, and is increaſed and multiplied by propagation, ſhall ariſe in the day of judgement.* Theſe ſingular opinions being now rejected and confuted by Eſtius, Sentent. 2. Diſtinct. 30. Paragraph. 13. and whatſoever Lombard bringeth for himſelf, anſwered in his next Paragraph; let us grapple with Holcot, who is a ſecond unto Lombard, and let us prove, *That originall ſinne is not the concupiſcence of the fleſh.* See this confuted by * Bellarmine, by this argument; *If LUST were the cauſe of originall ſinne, he ſhould have the greater ſinne, who was conceived in greater LUST: which is manifeſtly falſe, ſince originall ſinne is equall in all men.* See other arguments well uſed to that purpoſe by Bellarmine in that place; yet is he amiſſe *elſewhere, in the anſwer unto the tenth argument of the Anabaptiſts. For, ſaith he, *Originall*

* Lomb. 2. Sent. diſt. 30. lit. N.

1. *Quòd in veritatem humanæ naturæ nihil tranſit extrinſecum.* 2. *Quod ab Adam deſcendit, per propagationem auctum & multiplicatum, reſurget in judicio.* pag. 985.

* Bell. De Amiſſ. Gratiæ 4. 12.

* *De Sacramento Baptiſmi* 1. 9.

*Originale peccatum non eſt materia pœnitentiæ: nemo enim rectè pœnitentiam agit ejus peccati quod ipſe non commiſit, & quod in ejus poteſtate non fuit. Originale autem peccatum non ipſi commiſimus, ſed trahimus ab Adam per naturalem propagationem: unde dicitur de infantibus, Rom. 9 11.

ſinne is no matter of repentance: for a man doth not well repent of that ſinne which he hath not committed himſelf, and which was not in his power. Now we have not our ſelves committed originall ſinne, but we draw it from Adam by naturall propagation: whereupon it is ſaid, Rom. 9. 11. of Eſau and Jacob, THEY HAD DONE NEITHER GOOD NOR EVIL. Firſt, I anſwer to the place of Scripture, confeſſing it is ſpoken of Eſau, wicked Eſau, that he had done no evill; and of Jacob, good Jacob, that he had done no good. Again, it is ſpoken of both of them, before they were born. But ſecondly, it is ſpoken of actuall ſinnes and actuall goodnes; that neither did Jacob good, actuall good, any good in the wombe, nor Eſau any actuall evil. For the bodily organs are not ſo fitted, that they exerciſe ſuch actions as produce good or evil. The words do evince ſo much, *μηδὲ πραξάντων τι ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν, practically working no good nor evil.* Yet, though God depended not upon their works (as the Apoſtle there argueth) for all that, they might and did commit originall ſinne, and in it were conceived: and the promiſe was made to Rebecca, after ſhe conceived, Geneſ. 25. 23. It being then manifeſt, that the place of the Apoſtle affordeth no patrociny to Bellarmine, I ſay originall ſinne is in part the matter of Repentance; otherwiſe, David in his chiefeſt penitentiall Pſalme, 51. 5. would not have charged himſelf with that ſinne, nor needed not ſo vehemently to call for mercy. Again, we may be ſaid to commit originall ſinne, and originall ſinne to have been in our power, as we were in Adam, as we would have done the like, and the like againſt Adam, as Adam did againſt us, if we had ſtood in Adams place, as he did ſtand in our ſtead. Thirdly, our will was in his will, & what he did we did: Bellarmines Philoſophie here ſwalloweth up his Divinitie. Fourthly, he muſt not take *committere* ſtrictly, for a full free deliberate action of commiſſion; nor *trahere* ſtrictly, for a meer paſſion: but (as I ſhall make it appear) there is ſome little inclination, from the matter to the form, of the body to the ſoul, as alſo of the ſoul to the body; and that the ſoul is neither as a block or ſtone on the one ſide, to receive durt and be integrally paſſive, nor yet ſo active as to make the originall ſinne to be actuall. So that it neither properly committeth, nor properly contracteth, draweth, or receiveth originall ſinne: and yet in a large ſenſe may be ſaid both to commit and to receive. Fifthly, if Bellarmine be punctilious for the terms, himſelf is faultie: For he ſaith, * *We do attract originall ſinne from Adam.* Is there any *attraction* on our part, if there be no action? Or is action, or attraction without ſome kinde of commiſſion? Sixthly, hath the whole Church of God prayed for the remiſſion aſwell of originall ſinne as of actuall, if it be not the matter of repentance? Or needeth not one unbaptized, till he come of age, repent before Baptiſme, for his originall ſinne?

*Trahimus ab Adam originale peccatum.

Laſtly,

Laſtly, why are children baptized, but that originall ſinne is matter of repentance?

To ſet all things better in order, and to cleare all miſts, you are to know, that there is wonderfull miſtaking, and ambiguitie, whil'ſt originall ſinne is confounded with Adams actuall ſinne, and one taken for another, whil'ſt the cauſe is undiſtinguiſhed from the effect, when indeed there is a great traverſe between them.

2 Somewhat according to the new Maſters of method, the efficient cauſe of Adams ſinne was both outward and inward.

Outward { Remote, / Propinque.

Remote { Principall, Satan. / Inſtrumentall, the Serpent.

Outward propinque was { Eve, the principall. / The apple was the inſtrumentall cauſe.

The inward efficient cauſe was; firſt, the faculties of the ſoul, which we may terme the *principium activum*, and was more remote; then the ill uſe of theſe faculties, the miſimploying of his free-will, which you may ſtile *principium actuale*, and was the more propinque cauſe. But the cauſe efficient of originall ſinne was, outwardly, the actuall ſinne of Adam; inwardly, the conjunction of the ſoul, after the propagation of nature. The matter of Adams ſinne, *ſubjectivè*, was the whole perſon and nature of Adam, and his poſteritie deſcending from him *per viam ſeminalem*; *objectivè*, the liking, touching, and eating of the forbidden fruit. The matter of originall ſinne, *ſubjectivè*, is all of our nature, and every one of mankinde, *ſecundum ſe totum & totum ſui*, coming the ordinarie way of generation: in ſo much, that all and every of the faculties of the ſoul and bodie, of all and every one of us, is ſubject to all and every ſinne, which hath been, or may ever hereafter be committed: and this cometh onely from this originall ſinne, and the inclination wrapped up in it. The matter *objectivè*, is both *carentia juſtitiæ originalis debitæ ineſſe*, and the vices contrarie unto it, now filling up its room and ſtead. *Formalis ratio of Adams firſt ſinne was averſion from God, the ratio materialis was his converſion to a changeable good*, ſaith * Stapleton: both theſe are knit up in one diſobedience. And ſo, the formall cauſe of Adams ſinne was diſobedience; the formall cauſe of our originall ſinne is the deformitie and corruption of nature, ſalne and propagated, inclining to ſinne ſo ſoon as is poſſible, and (without a divine hand of reſtraint) as much as is poſſible. The end of Adams ſinne was in his intention, primarily, *To know good and evill*; ſecundarily, to prefer temporals before ſpirituals; whil'ſt indeed he eſteemed the *Bonum apparens* before the *Bonum verum revera*, or *reale*. In

*Stapl. De Originali Peccato l. 12.

mankinde after him no end can be found of originall ſinne, ſince we contract it when we have *nullum verum aſpectum, reſpectum, intuitum, vel-finem.* For *Finis & bonum convertuntur.* There is no end of evill, *per ſe, ſed ex accidenti*; and ſo Gods Glory is the ſupreme end of all ſinne. The effects of Adams actuall ſinne were, his *Corruptio perſonæ, Reatus, & Pœna,* as he was conſidered by himſelf, till he repented; but as he was the Referree and Repreſentor of mankinde, the effects were, The corruption of our nature, our fault, our guiltines, our puniſhment, till we be freed. The effects of our originall ſinne are, ſinnes actuall, with all the penalties or puniſhments due to them. Moreover, that we may more diſtinctly enlarge this point, and remove the doubtfulneſſe of termes, know, that in a larger ſenſe, the actuall ſinne of Adam may in a ſort be ſaid to be originall ſinne; it may be called Adams originall ſinne, as it was firſt and originally in him. It may be originall ſinne both of Adam and all his poſterity; becauſe our naturall defects, and all manner of ſinnes flowed originally from this onely ſinne, as from a defiled fountain. Yet properly, this ſinne was in him actually, in us potentially; in him explicitly, in us implicitly; in him perſonally, in us naturally; in him *perſe*, in us *per accidens*. And that his firſt ſinne or averſion from God, may both be ſaid to be his originall ſinne, and the cauſe alſo of our originall ſinne; the cauſe, not phyſicall or naturall (for he doth not traduce, by the vertue of that ſinne, any real thing which is properly ſinfull, unto his poſterity) but it was and is the morall cauſe of our originall ſinne. As originall ſinne is by ſome deſcribed, namely, *to be propagated, to be in all alike,* and *to be in the humane creature at the beginning of his being*, or to be *an hereditarie tranſgreſſion:* ſo Adam had not originall ſinne, but onely his poſterity. As originall ſinne is defined to be *That ἀνομία or tranſgreſſion, that totall averſion of mankinde from God, whereby we incurre death and damnation:* ſo was Adams ſinne our originall ſinne, and he had originall ſinne.

3. Which the fuller to demonſtrate, let me inſiſt on this point, namely, *That ſinne of Adam we ſinned this way, as we were in him materialiter, though not formaliter.* As the ſeverall members of a mans body united to his ſoul, make one individuall perſon: ſo all the branches of Adams poſteritie, with himſelf, make one humane nature, and are as it were but one by participation of the *ſpecies.* * *All were in Adam when he ſinned: they were indeed in him, but they were not yet born themſelves*, ſaith Auguſtine, *De Civit.* 13.14. and more punctually in the ſame Chapter, * *The form in which every one of us ſhould live, was not yet created and diſtributed to us; but the ſeminall nature was alreadie, of which we were to be propagated.* Anſelm ſaith, * *The infant that is damned for originall ſinne, is not damned for the ſinne of Adam, but for his own:*

*Fuerunt omnes in Adam quando peccavit; fuerunt quidem in illo, ſed nondum nati erant ipſi.

*Nondum erat nobis ſingillatim creata & diſtributa forma, in qua ſinguli viveremus; ſed jam natura erat nobis ſeminalis, ex qua propagaremur.

own: for if he himſelf had not his own ſinne, he ſhould not be damned. And therefore Auguſtine, *Retractat.* 1.13. * *Originall ſinne in infants, though they have not yet the uſe of freewill, is not abſurdly called voluntary.* And *Confeſſ.* 1.7. * *The weaknes of infantine members, not the ſoul of infants is innocent.* Laſtly, *De Peccat. Meritis & Remiſſ.* 3. 8. as he calleth originall ſinne oftentimes *Alienum peccatum*, to ſhew it began not in us alone, but was delivered to us, came from without: ſo in the ſame place he termeth it *Peccatum proprium*, our ſelves ſinning in and with Adam, and having corruption in us by him. It can not ſink into my head, that God would have imputed unto us Adams fault, by his abſolute irreſpective decretory will of good pleaſure: but that he whoſe foreſight reacheth to things that are not, yea to things that ſhall never be, much more to things certainly future (of which in another place) did foreknow and preconſider, that every one of mankinde, if they had been in Adams ſtate and place, would have done as Adam did. Therefore, let us not accuſe God, or lay the fault onely on Adam; our ſelves would have done ſo. For, as one ſaid concerning the thief on the Croſſe, confeſſing Chriſt when Chriſt was on the Croſſe nailed, naked, pained, reviled, ſcorned, dying, and forſaken of his own Diſciples, *Profectò ego non ſic feciſſem, I ſhould not have made ſo glorious a confeſſion as the penitent thief did at that time:* So, on the contrary, I ſay, and am fully perſwaded, *I ſhould have done as Adam did.* Let God be juſt, and all men faulty; for it would have been the fault of all men. Yea, I muſt go one ſtep further, and without boldnes juſtifiably ſay, by verdict of Scripture, it was the fault of all men; all men did ſinne that ſinne in Adam. It is not ſaid *Propter hominem*, but, *Per hominem Mors*, 1 Cor. 15.21. and Rom. 5.12. ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον: *In quo, in whom all ſinned.* Of the firſt man, Adam, are all theſe words [*By man, and in whom*] to be underſtood: and *by him, and in him all died and ſinned*, ſaith the Apoſtle; and ſinned that ſinne by which death came into the world. Though the father of the faithfull payed tithes of all unto Melchiſedec, before Levi was born, and Abraham alone perſonally diſcharged that duty; yet for all this, the Apoſtle ſaith, Hebr. 7.9. *Levi alſo who receiveth tithes, payed tithes in Abraham; for he was yet in the loyns of his father:* So on the contrary, though Adam, the univerſall father of mankinde, did actuate that great offence long before we were created; yet we alſo concurred in our kinde, and were partakers in that iniquity. For he ſtood *Idealiter* for us, and we were in him; our will in his, our good and hurt in his: and ſo farre as he received a law for us, ſo farre as he repreſented us; ſo farre when he ſinned did we ſinne in him, with him, and by him. And if the worthy S. Auguſtine may ſay, as is before cited, * *Omnes eramus ille unus Adam*; I hope I may as well ſay, *Adam ille erat nos*

* *Infans qui damnatur pro peccato originali, non damnatur pro peccato Adam, ſed pro ſuo: nam ſi ipſe non haberet ſuum peccatum, non damnaretur.* Anſel. De Partu Virginis. cap. 2.

* *Originale peccatum in parvulis, cùm adhuc non utantur libero arbitrio voluntatis, non abſurdè vocatur voluntarium.*

* *Imbecillitas membrorum infantilium innocens eſt, non animus infantium.*

* *De Peccat. Merit. & Remiſſ.* 1.10.

nos omnes. I am ſure, Proſper in his Sentences pickt out of Auguſtine ſaith, that * *The firſt man Adam ſo died in time paſt, that yet after him Chriſt is the ſecond man, although ſo many thouſands of men be born between that and this: and therefore it is evident, that every one who is born propagated from that ſucceſsion belongs to that former, as whoſoever is born again by the liberalitie of grace pertains to this latter: whence it comes to paſſe that all mankinde, in ſome ſort, conſiſt in two men,* THE FIRST *and* THE SECOND. Yea, the whole world, except Chriſt onely, as men, are the firſt Adam; and the firſt Adam, as he beleeved in Chriſt to come, is not now the firſt, but a branch of the ſecond Adam. What Chriſt did for us, we are ſaid to do; what Adam did miſdo, as he repreſented us, we may juſtly be ſaid to miſdo with him, Geneſ. 4. 10. *The voice of thy brothers bloud crieth unto me: Sanguinum*; yea, *Seminum*, ſaith the Chaldee Paraphraſe, and the Rabbins; whom, howſoever the Jeſuit Cornelius à Lapide faulteth, yet I will commend for their witty invention, *That God ſeemed, as it were, to heare the cries of all thoſe many little ones, which ever might have deſcended from Abel; and them Cain killed, and their bloud he ſhed even ere they were, and their bloud cried in Abels.* So we conſented with Adam, and *in him all ſinned*, ſaith our Apoſtle: Ἐφ' ᾧ, our lateſt Tranſlation hath it *For that all have ſinned,* The Biſhops Bible *in as much as we have all ſinned:* So Eraſmus, and ſome others; yet our lateſt Tranſlation alloweth a place in the margin for *in whom*: it is rendred by the Vulgat, *In quo.* Ἐφ' ᾧ is not here taken for a Prepoſition, of whoſe various conſtructions ſee the Grammarians; none of which conſtructions afford ſo full and punctuall a ſenſe to this place, as if we render the words Ἐφ' ᾧ, *in whom:* ἐπὶ being a Prepoſition by it ſelf, and ᾧ being the Dative of the ſubjunctive relative article ὅς. The Genevian readeth it *in whom*, and interprets the words *in whom* to be *in Adam:* and ſo indeed it may be read and muſt be meant; for though the Prepoſition ἐπὶ be otherwiſe rendred and uſed, yet divers times it is confounded with ἐν, and neceſſarily is ſo to be underſtood. View in one Chapter two places, Hebr. 9. 10. Μόνον ἐπὶ βρώμασι καὶ πόμασι, *Solummodo in cibis & potibus, Which ſtood onely in meats and drinks*, as our very late Tranſlatours have it. And verſ. 17. Διαθήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία, *Teſtamentum enim in mortuis ratum eſt:* ſo word for word is it conſtrued. So Demoſthenes hath it, Ἐπὶ τούτοις μένειν, *In his acquieſcere.* Baſil in his Epiſtle to Nazianzen, Ἐπὶ τῆς ἐσχατιᾶς τούτης, *In hac ſolitudine.* So we uſually ſay Ἐφ' ἡμῖν, *In nobis*, and the like. This reading being eſtabliſhed, let us ſearch the meaning of theſe words *In whom* or *in which*, and to what they are referred. There are but foure things, to which theſe words can poſſibly have relation. Firſt, unto the word Κόσμῳ; and then the ſenſe is, *By one man ſinne entred into the world, in which world all have*

* *Primus homo Adam ſe olim defunctus eſt, ut tamen poſt illum ſecundus homo ſit Chriſtus, cum tot hominum millia inter illum & hunc orta ſint: & idcò manifeſtum eſt pertinere ad illum, omnem qui ex illa ſucceſſione propagatus naſcitur; ſicut ad iſtum pertinet omnis qui gratiæ largitate in illo renaſcitur: unde fit, ut totum genus humanum quodam modo ſint homines duo,* PRIMUS & SECUNDUS. Proſp. Sent. 299.

have ſinned. This expoſition is very abſurd. For firſt, it is nothing to the intent of the Apoſtle, who proveth that we fell in Adam, and are raiſed by Chriſt: but how conduceth this unto that ſenſe? Secondly, the ſenſeleſneſſe of the words is moſt ridiculous, being thus read, *As by one man ſinne entred into the world, and death by ſinne, and ſo death paſſed upon all men, in which world all have ſinned.* The Spirit of wiſedome would not ſpeak ſo, nor the God of order ſo diſjointedly. The ſecond expoſition is as unlikely, and that readeth it, *In which death all have ſinned:* but as * S. Auguſtine ſaith, *Men die in ſinne, not ſinne in death.* The phraſe is improper: yet grant that ſome ſinne in death, yet it is moſt untrue *That in death all ſinne.* The third word to which *In whom*, or *which* may be referred, is *Sinne: In which ſinne all have ſinned*; and thus * Auguſtine did interpret it once. And if it were ſo to be read, it is all one in effect, to ſay, *In Adam all ſinned*, and, *In which ſinne* (of Adam) *all ſinned.* But * Auguſtine afterward more accuratly examining the place, rejecteth that expoſition, and confirmeth another by the authority of S. Hilarie. And indeed Grammaticall conſtruction overthroweth the ſenſe: for ἁμαρτία is the feminine gender, to which the words ἐφ' ᾧ can have no good reference. Therefore the laſt expoſition is beſt, which renders it *In quo, In which* (Adam) *all have ſinned.* So it is expounded by Hilarie, Auguſtine, and Ambroſe; by Origen, Chryſoſtom, Theophylact, Oecumenius, and generally both by the Greek and Latine Fathers; and the Apoſtle ſtrongly argueth for this ſenſe, verſe 19. *By one mans diſobedience many were made ſinners.* In him we ſinned. And whoſo ſhall throughly weigh both the precedent and ſubſequent dependances, muſt needs acknowledge that the words *In whom*, or *In which* do point at Adam onely; *in whom*, as in a maſſe, we were contained, and *in him* ſinned. Photius thus, * *In this we our ſelves die with Adam, that our ſelves have ſinned with him: he gave the beginning to ſinne, — we have been helpers to him.* And, *Neither by the Devill, who ſinned before the woman; nor by the woman, who ſinned before her huſband; but by Adam, from whom all mortality draweth its beginning, did ſinne truly enter into the world, and death by ſinne.* So farre Origen. Auguſtine likewiſe, * *In Adam all have ſinned, when all were that one man.* So punctually ſpeaketh he. For we were in Adam radically, ſeminally, repreſentatively. Adam was our head; he did lead the whole body into evill: he was our parent; all the iſſue of him were diſinherited by him. Auguſtine thus, * *We have all ſinned in Adam willingly; not by our own will, but by his will with whom and in whom we were one man, and one will of all.* As the King repreſents the Kingdome, and the chief Magiſtrate the Citie, and the Maſter of the houſe the houſhold; ſo did Adam repreſent us; and in him, and with him we ſinned.

* *In peccato moriuntur homines, non in morte peccant.* Aug. Cont. duas Epiſt. Pelag. 4.4.

* Aug. De Peccat. Merit. & Remiſ. 1. 10.

* Vide Aug. Cont. 2. Epiſt. Pelag. 4.4.

* *In hoc ipſi Adam commorimur, quòd in ſi compeccavimus: ille initium dedit peccato, —— nos adjutores illi fuimus.*

* *In Adamo omnes peccaverunt, quando omnes ille unus homo fuerunt.* Aug. De Baptiſmo parvulorum 1. 10

* *Peccavimus omnes in Adamo voluntariè; non voluntate noſtrâ propriâ, ſed voluntate illius cum quo & in quo eramus unus homo, atq; una omnium voluntas.* Aug. Epiſt. 23. Ad Bonifacium.

4. I can

4. I can not part with this ſecond point, till I anſwer the objection, *Whether Chriſt were in Adam.* The doubt will be cleared by theſe two Poſitions. Firſt, *Chriſt may be ſaid to be in Adam ſome kinde of way.* Therefore the Evangeliſt derives Chriſts Genealogie from him, and he is ſaid to be *The Sonne of Adam,* Luke 3. 38. And if he be called *The Sonne of David*, as often he is, Matth. 21. 9. Mark 10. 47. Rom. 1. 3, *He was made of the ſeed of David according to the fleſh:* if *he took on him the ſeed of Abraham*, as he did, Hebr. 2. 16, and *is fleſh of our fleſh and bone of our bones*, and *we of his*, Epheſ. 5. 30, it muſt needs be confeſſed, *He was in Adam.* Paracelſus talketh of *Non-Adami*, ſuch as deſcended not from Adams loyns: theſe, if ſuch, are monſters in nature, and as great a monſter in Divinitie is it, to ſay, that Chriſt was no way in Adam. I will enlarge this by a diſtinction. Chriſt was not in Adam, no, nor we neither, ſo, that our ſubſtances, or any part thereof, were really or materially in him. Yet, both Chriſt and we were in him. Firſt, becauſe mediatly we were born of him, and becauſe he was the efficient cauſe of generation; not the immediate, propinque, and proximous cauſe thereof, which neceſſarily communicateth ſome matter to that which is begotten: but he was the remote, mediate, yea the furtheſt, and moſt diſtant efficient naturall cauſe of all; from which it is not neceſſary that its matter reach to the hindermoſt effects. Secondly, becauſe if he had not begotten children, neither Chriſt in his humane nature, nor we now long after him, had ever been born. Thirdly, Chriſt took fleſh of the thrice-bleſſed Virgin Mary; and ſhe was in Adam, (as all others are, except Chriſt) ſhe was begotten by the concurrence and cooperation both of man and woman: and ſo, inasmuch as his holy Mother was in Adam, Chriſt in a ſort may be ſaid to be in Adam.* *Chriſt was of Adams kindred,* ſaith Holcot.

* *Chriſtus fuit de genere Adæ.* Holcot. De Imputabilitate peccati.

The ſecond Poſition is this, *Chriſt was not in Adam every manner of way, as we were.* For we differed in this peculiar ſort and manner, becauſe we were in Adam *ſecundum ſeminalem rationem, quâ, per communionem vtriuſq; ſexûs, fit generatio.* For Adam could beget no childe without a femal ſex; which was one main reaſon of Eves creation: neither did ever daughter of Eve conceive without a different ſex (except onely that ſtupendious miracle of our Saviours Incarnation) And after this manner Chriſt was not in Adam. He had true fleſh from Adam; but it was onely *the liſienes* or ſimilitude *of ſinfull fleſh* that he had, Rom. 8. 3. All other fleſh, except his, is the fleſh of ſinne. Had he come from Adam every way exactly as wee do, he had had not onely true fleſh, as he had, but true ſinne alſo: but becauſe he had not *Patrem naturalem*, as Scotus phraſeth it; therefore, neither did he ſinne in Adam, nor was in Adam as we were.

Lombard

Lombard * enquireth, *Why Levi was tithed in Abraham, and not Christ, when each of them was in the loyns of Abraham, in regard of the matter.* He answereth, * *The Leviticall order which was in Abraham according to the seed; descends from him by the concupiscence of the flesh: But Christ came not according to the common law or lust of the flesh.* And he resolveth thus, *When Levi and Christ according to the flesh were in the loyns of Abraham, when he was tithed, therefore was Levi tithed, and not Christ, because Christ was not in the loyns of Abraham, after some manner or other that Levi was.* Moreover, how could Christ be tithed to Christ? how could the same, in the same regard, both pay and take? Melchisedec was a figure of Christ, and tithes by an everlasting law were due to the priesthood of Melchisedec; as is unanswerably proved by my reverend friend (now a blessed Saint, Doctor Sclater) against all sacrilegious Church-robbers. Therefore Christ was not to be tithed in Abraham, though Levi was. Yea, if Aaron, or Melchisedec himself had lived till Christ had come in the flesh, and lived with him; perhaps they would have resigned up, as it were, their Office, and no more have taken tithes; or continuing in Office Sacerdotall under him, they would have taken tithes in his name, and for him. Aquine out of Augustine thus, * *After what manner soever Christ was in Adam and Abraham and in other Fathers, other men were there also, but not contrariwise.* And Aquine himself setteth his conclusion, *When the body of Christ windeth up to the Fathers, and so to Adam, mediante Matris suæ corpore, Christ was not in them, secundum aliquid signatum & determinatum, sed secundum originem.* Which, I imagine, he establisheth against such as (Lombard saith) did hold, *That from Adam descended, by way of generation, some such part or parcell as of it Christ was made.* Against which Aquine argueth thus, (whether modestly enough and truly, let others judge) *The matter of Christs body was not the flesh and bone, or any other actuall part of the Ever-blessed Virgin, but onely her bloud, which was potentiâ caro.* * *But what she received from her parents was actually part of her, but not part of Christs body. Nor was Christs body in Adam and the other Fathers, secundum aliquid signatum,* so that any part of Adams body, or of the other Fathers, could determinatly be pointed out, and be said to be the very exact individuall matter out of which Christs body was framed: but Christ was in Adam *secundum originem*, as others were. Whil'st Christ was in the wombe of the most happy Virgin Mary, even many moneths before her delivery she was called, Luke 1.43, Μήτηρ τοῦ Κυρίου μου, *The mother of my Lord*: which words, in part, Elisabeth took from Davids speculation, Psal. 110.1. *The Lord said unto my Lord.* Never woman was truly called or to be called a Mother, before she were delivered, except onely the Al-gracious Virgin Mary; who could not possibly suffer abortion, nor lose

* Lomb. lib. 3 dist. 3.

* *Leviticus ordo qui in Abraham secundum rationem seminalem erat, ex eo per concupiscentiam carnis descendit: Sed Christus non descendit secundum legem communem, aut carnis libidinem.*

* *Quamodocunq; Christus fuit in Adam & Abraham & in aliis Patribus, alii homines etiam ibi fuerunt.* Aquin. part. 3. quæst. 31. art. 6. ex Aug. De Gen. ad lit. 10. 19.

* *Corpus Christi non seminaliter conceptum est, sed ex castissimis & purissimis sanguinibus.* Aquinas ex Damasceno.

loſe that *Bleſſed Fruit* of her wombe, by the ſinne of man, or the puniſhment of mankinde for ſinne: which was conceived in her, without the help of man or ſinne, and was even then Lord of all things.

5 Another point followeth, towit, *We ſinned that ſinne in Adam, not by imitation onely.* For Adam ſinned, and in a ſort imitated Eve, who ſinned firſt, and ate of the forbidden fruit before him: yet it is not ſaid, That in Eve Adam died, or many died in Eve, or Adam ſinned through Eve. So likewiſe the Devill offended before Adam was, and Adams ſinne did nearly in many particulars reſemble the Devils: yet Adam died not by the ſin of the Devil, though after a faſhion he did imitate it. But it is ſaid, Rom. 5. 15, *Through the offence of Adam many be dead:* and thereabouts, *In Adam all die.* Therefore this ſinne of ours muſt needs be more then by imitation. And this is S. Auguſtines argument againſt Pelagius, *If it had been by imitation onely,* * *The Apoſtle had not made Adam the beginning of ſinne, but the Devill.* Againſt Julian, 6. 10. he uſeth this other argument in effect, *Who almoſt (yea, who at all?) thinketh of Adam, when he ſinneth? whereas the imitator propoundeth himſelf a pattern to follow and imitate. Or what is Adams eating of an apple like unto witchery, blaſphemy, murder, lying, or the like? and how there have been, yea are yet, many millions in the world who never heard of Adam, much leſſe of his ſinne? and did they intend to imitate, or did they imitate him?* Thirdly, * Auguſtine thus argueth, *As the ſecond Adam (beſides this, that we are to follow him, and imitate him) giveth hidden grace unto the faithfull: ſo (contrarily) we are faulty, and die not by the imitation onely of the firſt Adam, but by the ſecret blot and ſpot by which he hath infected us.* Fourthly, he thus diſputeth in his 89 Epiſtle to Hierome, *The Apoſtle ſaith,* Rom. 5. 16, *The fault is of* One *offence to condemnation: but he muſt have ſaid, It had been of* Many *offences, and not of* One, *if all are condemned for their actuall & perſonall imitation of Adam, ſince the offences of many men muſt needs be more then the* One *offence ſpoken of by the Apoſtle.* Laſtly, let me reaſon thus; Rom. 5. 14, *Death reigned from Adam to Moſes, even over them that had not ſinned after the ſimilitude of Adams tranſgreſsion.* But death was the wages of ſinne. Therefore ſome died who did not reſemble Adam in ſinning. And there is a ſinne not like to his; for Adams ſinne was actuall, moſt voluntary, and perſonall. Children in ſinning of originall ſinne do not imitate Adam: for their ſinne was onely implicit, in and with him; and they have not that abſolute freedome of will that he had; and their ſinne is rather naturall then perſonall. Yet, children die for ſinne, and for ſuch a ſinne as is not after the ſimilitude of Adams tranſgreſſion; and ſo originall ſinne cleaveth unto us, not by imitation onely. * Auguſtine thus, *If imitation onely make ſinners by Adam, onely imitation ſhould make us juſt by Chriſt;*

*Apoſtolus peccati principium non feciſſet Adamum, ſed Diabolum.

*De Peccat. Merit. & Remiſſ. 1. 9.

*Aug. De Peccat. Merit. & Remiſſ. 1. 15.

Christ; and then, not Adam and Christ, but Adam and Abel should be compared. For Adam was the first wicked man, and just Abel, Hebr. 11.4. *the first just man: But these things are not thus. Therefore we sinned not onely by imitation of Adam.*

6 I come to a new point, namely, to prove, *That this sinne of Adam is not ours by imputation onely*; as if Adam alone had offended, and we were wholly cleare from that great sinne. Indeed Adams actuall first sinne, or his other sinnes after his repentance, as they were personall and private, are not imputed to us: For he was to answer for himself as well as we are. If we repent, what doth our repentance help him? If he had not changed his minde, and turned to God, himself alone should have been condemned, as himself alone was saved by his own repentance. That Adam was by divine wisdome brought out of his fall, is said, Wisd. 10.1. * *He hath been restored to pardon,* saith S. August. And in the Tribe of Judah there is to this day a den, or hole called *Spelunca Adam, The Cave of Adam,* & in it a rock, in which are two stony beds of Adam & Eves: and here they mourned *(as is delivered by Tradition,* saith Adrichomius) an hundred yeares for the murdered Abel: (*why not rather for their own sinnes,* say I?) This place is not farre from either *Ager Damascenus*; where they say Adam was made of that *Red earth,* which is *mirè tractabilis*, saith Adrichomius; or from that place which to this day is shewen, and recorded to be the plat of ground which drank up Abels bloud, when Cain slew him. And though I deny not but they might mourn for the death of Abel, yet they were more bound to mourn for that sinne of theirs, which brought death both upon Abel, and themselves, and all their posterity.

* *Venia redditus est.*

That Adam was a Type of Christ is expressed, Rom. 5.15: and unfolded in many excellent particulars by * Salianus. That the more eminent Types of Christ should be saved, is evinced, because of their resemblance, and conformitie, unto the Antitype: nor can it be proved, that ever any of his figures were condemned. For the shadow must follow the substance, and Christ that Proto-type being not onely saved, but called Jesus, because *he shall save his people from their sinnes,* Matth. 1.21. They are his people especially who in principal things resembled him: and wherein can they better resemble him, then in being blessed and saved as he was? But I return to Adam. Concerning Adam, Augustine saith thus, * *As for that first man, the father of mankinde, almost the whole Church agreeth, that* (Christ being in hell) *he there delivered him.* Concerning his body, that it arose, if other Saints of the Old Testament arose, and that it was besprinkled with the bloud of Christ dying, shall be shewed hereafter. And if God had such care of Adams body, or part of it, he shall be impudently unreasonable that shall say

* *Sal. Ad annum* 9301

* *De illo quidem primo homine, patre generis humani, quòd cum ibidem solverit, Ecclesia ferè tota consentit.* Aug. Epist. 99. Ad Euodium.

his ſoul is not in bleſſedneſſe. Now, as his perſonall repentance ſaved himſelf onely, and not one of his offspring; ſo, if he had died unrepentant, his ſinne or ſinnes, as they were perſonall, ſhould not have prejudiced one of his poſterities ſalvation.

Bellarmine* ſaith, *It was one of Tatianus his errours, That our firſt parents were damned.* Indeed Irenæus 1.30. aſcribes this opinion to Saturninus and Marcion, and chap.31. to Tatianus the firſt founder of it. Tertullian in his book *De Hæreſib.* towards the end, taxeth Tatian for the ſame opinion, and confuteth him thus, * *As if the branches being ſaved, the root alſo ſhould not be ſaved.* But in his book *De præſcript. adverſ. Hæreticos* (as it is cited by Bellarmine) there is no mention of Tatian, in Rhenanus his Edition. Auguſtine ſaith of the Tatians and Encratites, * *That they gainſay the ſalvation of the firſt men.* Where Bellarmine uſed another Edition then Eraſmus his, or was miſtaken in the collation. He who will ſee more into this point, let him conſult with Bellarmine, in the place above cited, and Salianus *ad Annum Mundi* 930. where he juſtly taxeth Rupert, for ſaying in this third book on Geneſ. chap.31. * *That the ſalvation of Adam is freely denied by many, and by none ſtrongly enough defended.* And he bringeth many authorities and proofs to the contrary. From Irenæus he bids them bluſh, for ſaying Adam was not ſaved: and more vehemently, *That, by ſaying ſo, they make themſelves Hereticks, and Apoſtates from the truth, and Advocates for the Serpent and Death.* God curſed not Adam and Eve, but the earth and the Serpent. Yea, before God pronounced any puniſhment againſt Eve or Adam, even in the midſt of his curſing of the Serpent, with the ſame breath he both menaced Satan, and comforted Adam and Eve with the gracious promiſe of the Meſſiah, Geneſ.3.15. Now, there was never any, unto whom God vouchſafed a ſpeciall promiſe of Chriſt, but they were ſaved. Indeed the Apoſtle reckoneth not Adam among the faithfull ones, Hebr.11. but one reaſon of this omiſſion is, becauſe he entreateth of ſuch faithfull ones onely as were much perſecuted; which Adam was not, ſo farre as is recorded. If it be further objected, *That God is called* THE GOD OF ABRAHAM, ISAAC, AND JACOB, Exod.3.6. Matth.22.32. *and is no where called* THE GOD OF ADAM, let it be anſwered, *That Adam is called* THE SONNE OF GOD, Luke 3.38. And I think he is too ſevere a judge, who ſaith a ſonne of God is damned. The Targum or Chaldee Paraphraſe (ſet forth by Rivius) on the Canticles chap.1. verſ.1. ſaith, * *That the firſt ſong that ever was made, was indited by Adam, in the time when his ſinne was forgiven him. Damianus à Goes, De Moribus Æthiopum*, makes this the belief of Zagazabo and the Ethiopians, for whom he negotiated, *That Chriſts ſoul deſcended into Hell for Adams ſoul,*

pag.

*Bell. De Amiſſ. Gratiæ 3.12.

*Quaſi non, ſi rami ſalvi fiunt, & radix ſalva ſit.

*Quòd contradicunt primorum hominum ſaluti. Aug. De Hæreſib. cap.25.

* Salvationem Adami & à multis liberè negari, & à nullo ſatis firmiter defendi.

*Et venit dies Sabbati, & protexit eum, & aperuit os ſuum, & dixit Pſalmum Cantici dici Sabbati.

pag.93. *and that Adam was redeemed by Christ from Hell*, pag.55;

How glorious was it for Christ, to save his first sheep? and how would the Devil glorie, if it were otherwise? Adams fig-leaves may be thought to be sharp, afflictive, and penitentiall. Epiphanius, *Hæres.46.* calleth Adam *Holy*, and saith, *We beleeve he is among those Fathers, whom Christ reckoneth alive, not dead: God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.* Irenæus saith, *Adam humbly bare the punishment laid upon him.* Can humility be damned? then may pride be saved. Josephus 1.2. recordeth, *That Adam foretold the universall destruction of the World; one by the floud, the other by fire.* And can the first of Mankinde, the first King, Priest, and Prophet of the World be condemned? Others probably conjecture, that before his death he called the chief of his children, grand-children, and their descendants, and gave them holy and ghostly counsel, as Abraham did, Genes.18.19. and Jacob, Genes.49.1,&c. and Moses, Deuteron.31.1,&c. Salianus fits him a particular speech at his death, and a witty Epitaph. Feuardentius, on Irenæus, thus relateth, *Nicodemus Christs Disciple, in the History ascribed to him* OF THE PASSION AND RESVRRECTION OF THE LORD, *reporteth, That our Lord Jesus Christ, when he descended into Hell in his soul, spake thus to Adam, and held his hand*, PEACE BE VNTO THEE, VVITH ALL THY SONNES, MY IVST ONES. *But Adam falling on his knees* (such spirituall knees as before his spirituall hand, which Christ held, while both their bodies were in the grave) *weeping-ripe, thus prayed with a loud voice, * I will magnifie thee, Lord, because thou hast received me, and hast not made glad mine enemies over me: Lord God, I have cried unto thee, and thou hast healed me; Thou hast brought up my soul from Hell, thou hast saved me from those that go down to the pit.* Thus Salianus in his *Scholia ad Annum* 930. Another ancient Apocryphal book affirmeth, that Adam repented. Didacus Vega, in his second Sermon on the fifth penitentiall Psalme, pag.443. thus, *Leonardus de Utino, in his Book De Legibus, Sermon de Pœnitentia, saith, That Adam repented not of his sinne, but remained obstinate till the death of Abel: but when he saw him lye dead at his feet, wallowed in his blood, and yet pale; and as in a glasse saw the deformity of death, he began to repent.* Strabo saith, *He was so sorrowfull, that he vowed chastity for ever, and would have performed it, if an Angel had not injoyned him the contrary. And from the authority of Josephus he saith, Adam was so sorry for Abel, that he wept an whole hundred yeares. But I beleeve*, saith Vega, *He rather wept for the cause, which was sinne, then for the very death of Abel.* Ludovicus Vertomannus, in his sixth Book, fourth Chapter, of his journey to India, hath recorded, that a Mahumetan Merchant told him, that at the top of an high mountain in the Iland of Zaylon, subject to the King of Narsinga, there is a den, in which Adam after his fall lived and

* *Exaltabo te, Domine, quoniam suscepisti me, nec delectâsti inimicos meos super me: Domine Deus, clamavi ad te, & sanâsti me; eduxisti ab inferis animam meam, salvâsti me à descendentibus in lacum.*

continued very penitently. And though their tradition reſts on an idle conjecture, becauſe there is yet ſeen the print of the ſteps of his feet, almoſt two ſpannes long, (for how ſhould they know they were his feet, rather then ſome giants?) and becauſe, how Adam ſhould come to this Iland, and why, cannot be ſhewed; yet, ſo farre as is probable, we will joyn iſſue with their beleef, to wit, *That he was penitent, and ſo ſaved.* Thus much be ſpoken concerning the ſalvation of Adams ſoul.

Concerning Adams actuall ſinne, though I ſaid truly before, That, as it was private and perſonall, it was not imputed to us; yet (I muſt needs ſay) as it was ideall and repreſentative, it was and is imputed to us. He who denieth this, let him alſo deny, that Chriſts active and paſſive Merits are imputed to us. Neither can the Divine providence be taxed with rigour, much leſſe with injuſtice, for imputing Adams ſinne unto us. For firſt, he imputeth not our own actuall and perſonall iniquities, but forgiveth us both this ſinne of Adam and all manner of our own ſinnes. Secondly, he imputeth Chriſts Merits unto us, as if we our ſelves had done them. *For as by one offence of one, judgement came upon all to condemnation: even ſo by the righteouſneſſe of one, the free gift came upon all men unto juſtification of life*, Rom. 5. 18. We are then not ſo accurſed by the imputation of the firſt Adams tranſgreſſion, as we are bleſſed by the imputation of the ſecond Adams holines. Yet is this ſinne originall not abſolutely and ſimply imputed unto us, if we take imputation for laying to our charge the ſinne of another, without any reference to any offence of our own: but it is imputed to us, as being both his ſinne and ours; though we concurred in our kinde, and he in his; he by an explicit act of his will, we by an implicit of ours. In vertue of the maſters will, the ſervant willeth, yea performeth many things. *He ſaith to one ſervant, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to a third, Do this, and he doth it*, Matth. 8. 9. In all tranſactions and negotiations, the wifes will is included in her huſbands. The father ſelleth away lands of inheritance for ever from the ſonne: and though the children be unborn, the childrens will was in the fathers, and bindeth them that yet are not. But of this, much more hereafter. So are we by Adam *ſold under ſinne*, Rom. 7. 14. *Which hath reference to the originall ſinne of Adam*, ſaith Auguſtine in his Retract. *By one mans diſobedience many were made ſinners*, Rom. 5. 19. Not as Bath-ſheba ſaid, 1 Kings 1. 21. *We ſhall be counted offenders*: Ἐσόμεθα, ſay the Septuagint; *Ero ego, & filius meus*, ſaith the Hebrew; that is, in others eſtimate: but Κατεστάθησαν, *Conſtituti ſunt, Were made*; which is more then *onely eſteemed ſinners*, more then this, *That Adams ſinne was imputed to us*, as excluding our own unrighteouſneſſe. For this originall ſinne is not meerly extranеall, ἀλλ' ἡ ἐνοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία, *but a ſinne*

that

that dwelleth in me, ſaith the Apoſtle, Rom. 7. 20. and *peccatum circumſtans*, Hebr. 12. 1. *which doth ſo eaſily beſet us*; called alſo there *a weight*, as depreſſing us. That I may avoyd amphibologie, and open the point plain, conceive me thus; as original ſinne is taken actively, for that ſinne of Adam, to which our will involvedly concurred, and which cauſed ſinne in us, it is called *Originale peccatum originans*: and again, as it is taken paſſively, for corruption traduced unto us, it is called *Originale peccatum originatum*; and both theſe wayes ſinne may be ſaid to be imputed to us, though ſomewhat differently. The former more properly is ſaid to be imputed, the latter more properly is ſaid to be propagated; yet both what Adam did, bearing our perſons: what we did in his loyns, by a kinde of implicit blinde obedient diſobedience; and what he propagated to mankinde, is all but onely one original ſinne, partly imputed, partly inherent.

O Judge moſt righteous, ô Father moſt mercifull, grant, I beſeech thee, that all of us who have been made Sinners by the Diſobedience of one, may likewiſe be made Righteous, and Sanctified, and Juſtified, and preſented blameleſſe before thee by the Obedience of one, of one, thy onely Sonne, in whom thou art well pleaſed, our onely ſweet Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt. Amen.

CHAP. VI.

1. *Originall ſinne is propagated unto vs. Originall ſinne properly is not in the fleſh before the union with the ſoul.*

2. *Biſhop Bilſon, Mollerus, Kemnitius, and Luther, in an errour. Biſhop Bilſons arguments anſwered. Conception taken ſtrictly by Phyſicians, &c. We are not conceived in originall ſinne, if we reſpect this conception. Conception taken largely by Divines. Thus we were conceived in ſinne.*

3. *A Phyſicall Tractate of conception clearing the point.*

4. *A Diſcourſe touching aborſives and abortives. Balthaſar Bambach anſwered. The Hebrew vowels not written at firſt when the conſonants were. Never any wrote till God had written the Two Tables.*

5. *The manner how the ſoul contracteth originall ſinne pointed at. Bodily things may work upon the ſoul.*

6. *Righteous men have unrighteous children. The contagion of originall ſinne is quickly ſpread.*

7. *No ſinne or ſinnes of any of our parents immediat or mediat do hurt the ſouls of their children, but onely one, and that the firſt ſinne of Adam.*

1 AT length we are come to ſhew, that original ſinne is traduced and propagated unto mankinde; and this is evident. For ſince Adams averſion remained, and was rooted in the nature of him as an habit, and ſince we have our nature from him, as he had it, not before he ſinned, but after ſinne, this averſion is left in nature. And this nature is conveyed unto us by generation; conveyed (I ſay) as corrupt, not as ſinfull: and ſo corrupt as fleſh and bloud can be, before a reaſonable ſoul be united to it. So that we being in Adam, *ſecundum cauſam ſeminalem, & propagandi virtutem*, our firſt father tranſmitted after his fall ſome corruption unto all his children. And this corruption was mingled with the whole nature of his poſterity; neither could a man ſingle out any part of any one, in which there was not ſome deal of that primitive corruption. And Adams offpring ever ſince hath made ſuch a tranſmiſſion as they received. As if one do throughly mingle a little leaven with a whole unleavened lump;

lump; not onely that maſſe may be ſaid to be perfectly leavened, but whatſoever is afterward incorporated into that maſſe. Such a leaven of corruption was mingled by Adam, and ſpread or diſperſed unto and by his poſteritie: or as a needle toucht by a loadſtone, imparteth its received vertue to other needles depending on it. From the will of every one of us, actuall ſinne is derived to all the other parts and faculties both of our bodies and ſouls: ſo from the will of the firſt parents by generation is original ſinne conveyed to all mankinde. Or rather thus, in Aquinas his words. * *The act of ſinne exerciſed by the hand or foot, is not made ſinne by the will of the hand or foot, but by the will of the whole man.* From which, as from a certain head or fountain, the motion of ſinne is derived to every member: ſo from the will of Adam, who was the fountain of humane nature, the whole aberration of nature is found culpable in us. And the means he thus there deſcribeth. *Though the ſoul be not in the ſeed, yet in it is a diſpoſitive vertue apt to receive the ſoul; which when it is infuſed, is conformed to it ſo farre as it is capable, becauſe* every thing received is in the receiver according to his capacitie.*

* *Actus peccati exercitus per manum vel pedem non habet rationem culpæ ex voluntate manûs vel pedis, ſed ex voluntate totius hominis.* Aquin. in Rom. 5. Lect. 3.

* *Quicquid recipitur eſt in recipiente per modum recipientis.*

I need not doubt to ſay, That the corruption which the fleſhly part draweth from our firſt parent, before the ſoul be united, is not ſinne, but a puniſhment of ſinne, a debilitie of nature, an effect of ſinne. For if the Embryo ſhould die, or ſuffer abortion before the infuſion and unition of the reaſonable ſoul, (as ſuch a time there is, & ſuch a thing may be) it muſt appeare in judgement, and, without extraordinarie mercy, be damned, if there were ſinne in it: but that a lump of fleſh, which onely lived the life of a plant, at the utmoſt the life of a brute creature (for indeed ſome abortions, ſeeming liveleſſe lumps, being pricked have contracted themſelves, and ſhewed they had ſenſe) which never had reaſonable ſoul or ſpirit, or life of man, (for thoſe three ſeverall lives are not onely virtually, but really diſtinguiſhed) I ſay, that ſuch a rude maſſe of fleſh ſhould be lyable to account, and capable of eternall either joy or pain, is ſtrange Divinitie; which yet followeth neceſſarily, if ſinne be in the ſeed, or unformed Embryo. But you may aſk, *When ſinne beginneth?* I anſwer, So ſoon as the ſoul is united, * *There is a reaſonable ſubject ſuſceptible of ſinne*; and then ſinne entreth. Original ſinne is in the reaſonable ſoul as in the proper ſubject, and is there formally: the fleſhly ſeed is the inſtrumentall means of traduction, both of humane nature and originall ſinne. Originall ſinne (in a large ſenſe) may be ſaid to be in the fleſh, and fleſhly ſeed virtually, as in the cauſe inſtrumental, and to be in it originally, cauſally, materially; and in ſuch ſort to be ſooner in the body then in the ſoul, by the order of generation and time: but exactly, and in moſt proper terms, ſinne is ſooner in the ſoul by the order of nature; and hath its firſt reſidence in the

* *Subeſt rationale peccati ſuſceptibile.*

the ſubſtance of the ſoul, then in the faculties of it, and laſt of all in the body.

2 In Biſhop Bilſons *Survey*, pag. 173. this Poſition following is produced, and maintained againſt him by his oppoſers, *Pollution, that is ſinne and reall iniquity, is not in our fleſh without the ſoul.* The Biſhop anſwereth very copiouſly, *The ſoul cometh not to the body preſently with the conception. Mothers and Midwives do certainly diſtinguiſh the time of quickning from the time of conceiving; neither doth the childe quicken preſently upon conception. That the body is not ſtraightway framed upon the conception, many thouſand ſcapes in all females, and namely women do prove. Phyſicians and Philoſophers interpoſe many moneths betweene the conception and the perfection of the body. Job ſaith, we were firſt as milk, then condenſed as cruds, after clothed with skinne and fleſh, laſtly compacted with bones and ſinews, before we received life and ſoul from God*, Job 10.10.— *The New Teſtament noteth three degrees in framing our bodies, Seed, bloud, fleſh.* Upon the premiſſes he thus argueth. *If nothing can be defiled with ſinne (as by your doctrine you reſolve) except it have a reaſonable ſoul; of neceſsitie we either had reaſonable ſouls at the inſtant of our conception, which is a moſt famous falſhood, repugnant to all learning, experience, and to the words of Job; or els we were not conceived in ſinne, which is a flat hereſie, diſſenting from the plain words of the Sacred Scriptures, and from the Chriſtian Faith.*

So farre Biſhop Bilſon. If company may excuſe his opinion, I adde theſe. Firſt, Mollerus accordeth with him, that "חֹלֶל is to be referred to the time of conception, ſo ſoon as "ever it was conceived in the wombe; and חֵם to the time "that the *Fœtus* lieth hid, & is carried in the wombe; ſignifying "the ſeed was impure, the conception was not without the "flames of concupiſcence, and all the maſſe of bloud that nou-"riſheth the Embryo, was defiled with vices in the wombe: and "laſtly, the maſſe of the Embryo, when in the firſt ardor of "conception it firſt began to be warmed by the wombe, was "contaminated with ſinne. Enough of Mollerus. Kemnitius in his *Examen de Peccato Originali*, pag. 167. thus, * *When the maſſe of the Embryo, in the firſt ardor of conception, began to be warmed and cheriſhed by the heat of the wombe, it was already defiled with ſinne; which defilement, according to Davids confeßion, was truly a ſinne, when the inſtruments of the minde, or of the will, or of the heart were not yet framed.* Luther, on the words *In iniquitatibus conceptus ſum*, thus, * *David ſpeaks not of any works, but ſimply of the matter and being; and he ſaith, The humane ſeed of which I have been conceived, is all corrupted with vice and ſinne. The matter it ſelf is infected: that clay of which this little veſſel hath begun to be faſhioned, is damnable: the fruit in the wombe, before we be born and beginne to be men, is ſinne.* Hierom, in his Commentary on the words,

Cùm maſſa Embryonis, in primo ardore conceptionis, primùm inciperet uteri calore foveri, jam erat peccato contaminata; quæ contaminatio, juxta Davidis confeſſionem, habebat veram rationem peccati, cùm nondum formata eſſent vel mentis, vel voluntatis, vel cordis organa.

Non loquitur David de ullis operibus, ſed ſimpliciter de materia & ipſo eſſe; & dicit, Semen humanum, id eſt, maſſa ex qua conceptus ſum tota eſt vitio & peccato corrupta. Materia ipſa vitiata eſt: lutum illud ex quo vaſculum hoc fingi cœpit, damnabile eſt: fœtus in utero, antequam naſcimur & homines eſſe incipimus, peccatum eſt.

words, * *Whatsoever is drawn and derived from Adam, is conceived and born in originall sinne.* Cajetan thus, * *This is the Text from which originall sinne is deduced, wherein every one is said to be conceived in originall sinne by the conjunction of male and female.*

All this shall not make me beleeve, that there is sinne and real iniquity without a reasonable soul. Illyricus is justly deserted, for saying, *The very substance of the soul is sinfull.* And these deserve as few followers, who say, *That the substantiall, bodily, soul-wanting masse is sinfull.* And I professe in this latter to take part with others rather, then with the otherwise most Reverend and learned Bishop. For * *There can be no sinne in a thing reasonles.* Unto Bishop Bilson I thus answer, That all his premisses are true, that I subscribe to his opinion, in the first member of his disjunction. The second part of it I do wholy deny; nor do I fear his aspersion of heresie. To the place of the Psalmograph, I answer with reverence by distinguishing. First, that the words *sinne* and *iniquitie* are taken rather for *inclinations to sinne*, then for *sinne properly so called:* thus we were conceived in sinne, that is, so soon as ever we were conceived, we had a propension and aptitude to sinne, such and as much as the flesh was then capable of. Augustine thus, * *Albeit cattell be void of reason, yet even of them we say oft, that they ought to be beaten when they sinne.* But let us leave the vulgar forms of speech. The said Father annexeth, * *To sinne, properly is but of him that useth the pleasure and liking of a reasonable will.* Secondly, If you will needs take sinne according to its true definition, then I distinguish of conception; which is used either strictly and properly, or at large and extensively. The first way is followed by Naturalists, Anatomists, Physicians, and Philosophers; the second way by Divines. The first way, they make conception to be an action of the wombe: for when the wombe hath begun its work with attraction,

(*Nam sitiens haurit Venerem, interiúsq; recondit*) and continued it, both by permixtion thereof and immuring retention; in the fourth and last place it ends the operation by the suscitation of the incloséd sperms, which is properly called * *conception.* The *spiritus artifex*, and the *fœtus* onely formeth, nourisheth, and increaseth what is done afterwards: the wombe onely containeth, and therefore conserveth, because the place is the conservation of the thing placed in it. To say, that we did sinne properly, when our mother thus conceived us, is to say we sinned before we had life: and we may aswell be said to sinne while we were in our fathers seed, (before their conjunction and commixture with our mothers, which is not an houre before conception) and so in their bloud before seed, and in their meat ere it was bloud. Thus, I dare say, the Spirit of God never meant that we were conceived in sinne, and the traducted matter

*Concipitur & nascitur in originali peccato quod ex Adam trahit.r.

*Hic est textus unde trahitur originale peccatum, quo scilicet ex commixtione maris & fœminæ conceptus dicitur in originali peccato.

*Culpa non potest esse in re irrationali.

*Etiam jumenta, quamvis sunt rationis expertia tamen plerumq; dicimus debere vapulare cùm peccant. Aug. De Adulterinis Conjugiis lib 1. circa medium.

*Propriè peccare, non est nisi ejus qui utitur rationalis voluntatis arbitrio. Holcot, *De Imputabilitate Peccati*, mendosè legit *argumento.*

* Vide Laurentii *Histor. Anatomicam* lib. 8. quæst. 12. pag. 619.

matter is not properly full of ſinne, or ſinneth at all. But take we conception largely, and as Divines do uſe the word, (for the preparatorie formation, or a degree of it, is a kinde of conception; as the exact formation unto the full grown meaſure, a little before the nativitie, may be called the completorie conception) we may be ſaid to be conceived in ſinne; conception being taken for the time of our perfecter formation, extendible almoſt to our nativitie. *In iniquitatibus conceptus ſum*, ſaith Lyra,* *Becauſe man deſcending from Adam by carnall generation, in the union of the ſoul with the body contracts original ſinne, which inclineth to actuall ſinnes.* Tremellius hath it, *In iniquitate formatus ſum, & in peccato fovit me mater mea*: and expounds it in this manner, * *I am guiltie of iniquitie and ſinne, being framed and warmed in the wombe; for theſe pertain not to the form of the conception, ſhaping, and warming, but to the conſtitution of the fruit.* Vatablus rendreth it, *In iniquitate genitus ſum------*, and interprets it, * *I have been faſhioned, framed, born.* * *Conceived me, that is, brought forth*, ſaith Emanuel Sà, out of Hierome, though I finde it not ſo in Hierom on the place. S. Auguſtine following the Septuagint, with Theodoret and others, for the reading *In iniquitatibus conceptus ſum*, hath theſe paſſages, * *The very band of death is grown together with ſinne it ſelf: None is born without drawing puniſhment, without drawing the merit of puniſhment*: and he doth in a ſort parallel this place with an other place of the Prophet (and it is in Job, I gheſſe, who may well be ſtiled a Prophet) *Nemo mundus in conſpectu tuo, nec infans, cujus eſt unius diei vita ſuper terram*, Job 15. 14. Our Engliſh late Tranſlatours vary thus, *I was ſhapen in iniquitie, and in ſinne did my mother conceive* or warm *me*, as it is in the margin: which ſhaping and warming is alſo after the union of the reaſonable ſoul to the body. Not one of all theſe doth take conception ſtrictly and phyſically, but largely, and ſignificantly enough both to the Scripture and to our purpoſe. Stapleton thus, * *The ſoul, not the fleſh, is the ſubject of vertues and vices.* Auguſtine, * *The ſeed is infected, not infection.* Godfridus Abbas Vindocinenſis, * *The death of the ſoul went not before from the corruption of the fleſh; neither doth the Devil infect the fleſh before he defile the ſoul.* Auguſtine, * *The corruptible fleſh doth not make the ſoul ſinfull, but the ſinful ſoul makes the fleſh to be corruptible.* Thus it was in Adam, is in us: our fleſh is not properly ſinfull or defiled before the ſoul inhabit it. Reaſon alſo is of our ſide: for if ſo ſoon as there is conception in the wombe, there is true ſinne, how many thouſand conceptions miſcarry, and never come to perfect formation? as in the *Mola*, where the forming of the parts being begun can not be perfected, but (the weak workman being drowned in abundance of bloud) in ſtead of a living creature is ingendred an ill-ſhaped, hard, and idle lump of fleſh, oppreſſing the wombe with its pon-

* *Quia homo deſcendens ab Adam per carnalem generationem, in unione animæ ad corpus contrahit peccatum originale, quod eſt ad actualia peccata inclinativum.*

* *Iniquitatis & peccati reus ſum; in utero formatus & fotus; hæc enim non ad formam conceptûs, formationis, & fotûs, ſed ad fœtûs conſtitutionem pertinent.*

* *Fictus ſum, formatus ſum, natus ſum.*

* *Concepit me, id eſt, peperit.*

* *Ipſum vinculum mortis cum ipſa iniquitate concretum eſt: nemo naſcitur niſi trahens pœnam, trahens meritum pœnæ.*

* *Anima, non caro, eſt ſubjectum virtutum & vitiorum.* Stapl. De Orig. Peccato 1.4.

* *Semen vitiatum eſt, non vitium.* Aug. Hypognoſt 2. initio.

* *Non ex carnis corruptione animæ mors præceſſit; nec Diabolus prius carnem noſtram infecit quàm animam.* Godfridus Abbas Vind. Epiſt. 39.

* *Non caro corruptibilis animam peccatricem, ſed anima peccatrix facit eſſe carnem corruptibilem.* De Civit 14.3. circa medium.

ponderousnes, (saith * one) as the stomach is loaded with indigestible meats. Is there sin in this conception? sin before life? sin when there is no motion? (as there is none in the lumpish *Mola*) sin in a Moon-calf? But put we the case in a perfect conception, which without mischance may come to formation & birth, and casually suffereth abortion before the soul be united; yet it can never be proved, that it sinned *In* & *At* the conception.

* Fernel. *De Hominis Procreatione* 7. 8.

The arguments that trendle that way are these, *The very seed, of which we were begotten and conceived, was an unclean thing* (saith Bishop Bilson) *as Job calleth it, saying, Who can make a clean thing of an unclean?* Job 14.4. *It is also corruptible, that is,* (saith he) *full of corruption, as Peter nameth it, when he saith, Born again, not of corruptible seed*, 1 Peter 1.23. *of which we were born of our parents. Thirdly, The Apostle calleth our flesh, The flesh of sinne*, Rom. 8.3. If by these places he takes uncleanesse, corruption, and sinne, improperly, for such ill dispositions as seed, bloud, and liveless flesh is capable of, the Question is ended: I confesse all. But he understandeth uncleanesse, corruption, and sinne, properly. The title of his pages 174. and 175. is this, *Mans flesh is defiled in conception, before the soul is created and infused.* And in the body of his Discourse he enlargeth it: as in his Conclusion to the Reader, at the end of his Sermons, pag. 252. he first propoundeth it, and citeth Ambrose to assist him, saying, * *Pollution sooner beginneth in man then life. Now the soul is the life of the body; then if pollution cleave to the flesh before life come, and consequently before the soul come, whencesoever it cometh, it is evident that Adams flesh defileth, and so condemneth us.* So farre he. None of these proofs reach home to cleare this, That sinne, true sinne, proper sinne, originall sinne or actuall is in the seed, or bloud, or flesh, before the reasonable soul be united. Neither did that learned Bishop consider, that it can not be called our originall uncleanesse, pollution, or sinne, till we have *originem*, that is, till our soul hath its first being in the body. He erreth to say, *Pollution cleaveth to the flesh before life cometh:* and more erreth, saying, *Adams flesh defileth and condemneth us*, if he make the flesh subject to condemnation, before its life and union of the soul. For then many thousand abortions should be damned, which never had rationall soul annexed to them. As for Ambrose, * Whitaker thus citeth him from the same Book and Chapter, * *Before we be born, we are stained with contagion; before we enjoy the light, we receive the injurie of our verie beginning.* Ambrose saith not, *We have sinne ere we have life*, but, *We are conceived in iniquity:* which is true, and confest, if we take conception largely: so Ambrose taketh *macula*, for such inclination to evill as is in the seed potentially maculative.

* *Prius incipit in homine macula quam vita.* Ambr. Apolog. David cap. 11.

* Whitak. De Origin. Peccato 1. 4. * *Antequam nascimur, maculamur contagio; antequam usuram lucis, originis ipsius accipimus injuriam.*

Concerning the place of Job: First, Job saith not, *The seed is unclean*, but, *Quis dabit mundum ex immundo?* Which may have reference

reference to the perſon, or the nature of the unclean father. Secondly, it may be a parallell with that of Job 25.4. *How can he be clean, that is born of a woman? yea the ſtarres are not pure in his ſight*, verſ.5. Laſtly, things may be ſaid to be unclean, that have no ſinne. Aſk the *unclean beaſts*, and they will juſtifie it; and the trees will ſend forth this truth as leaves. Levit.19.23,24. *The fruit of the trees planted ſhall be as uncircumciſed* (or unclean) *unto you three yeares, it ſhall not be eaten of: but in the fourth yeare it ſhall be holy, to praiſe the Lord withall:* yet was not the fruit ſinfull it ſelf, but *quoad uſum.*

The place of S. Peter is anſwered by the ſame Apoſtle, 1 Pet. 1.18. *Silver and gold are things corruptible*: yet theſe creatures, as creatures, are good in themſelves; & though they are cauſes of moſt ſinnes, yet have no ſinne: & many other corruptible things, as heaven & earth, are void of all ſinne. As concerning the place of the Apoſtle S. Paul, I anſwer, it is apparent he ſpeaketh of fleſh, after the ſoul is united; which is nothing to our Queſtion, and therefore a moſt impertinent proof of the Biſhop. Laſtly, the Reverend Biſhop bringeth this objection againſt himſelf, *How could David ſay he was conceived in ſinne, when at the conception he had neither ſoul nor body?* His main anſwer is; *With God nothing is more frequent, then to call thoſe things that are not, as though they were*, Rom.4.17. *and ſpeaketh in Scriptures of things to come, as if they were paſt or preſent. David and Job call that ſeed which was prepared to be the matter of their bodies, by the names of themſelves, becauſe it could not be altered what God had appointed. But the void conceptions of women which miſcarry before the body be framed, never had either life or ſoul, and ſo neither name nor kinde, but periſh as other ſuperfluous burdens and repletions of the body.* So he. I reply, (that I may not queſtion the worthy Biſhop about the meaning of that place, Rom.4.17.) He hath made a great ſtirre to little purpoſe, ſince he maketh many conceptions void of ſinne or puniſhment, like ſuperfluous burdens and repletions of the body, which none ever ſaid to have ſinned. Secondly, which is the better anſwer to the place of the Pſalmiſt, to ſay, as the Biſhop doth, *Conceptions which come to nothing are not ſinfull, but ſuch as may have ſouls are ſinfull before they have ſouls,* (whereby he ſplitteth himſelf on this rock, *That a perfect conception ſuſceptible of a ſoul, and aborſed caſually before the unition with the ſoul, is ſinfull and liable to account.*) or to anſwer with me, *That ſinne and iniquity in the place of the Pſalmiſt is taken for the aptitude to ſinne, which is in the matter*; or els, conception is taken in its latitude, for our time in the mothers wombe; and ſo true original ſinne not to be in the body without a ſoul. Aquine ſaith, * *Sith none but the reaſonable creature is ſuſceptible of fault, the childe conceived is not ſubject to ſinne before the infuſion of a reaſonable ſoul.* Whitaker ſaith well, * *That the fleſh covets nothing without*

* *Quum ſola creatura rationalis ſit ſuſcept. va culpæ, ante infuſionem animæ rationalis proles concepta non eſt peccato obnoxia.* Aquin. part. 3. Quæſt.27. art.2. in corp. art.

* *Carnem nihil concupiſcere ſine anima, nec doctius, nec doctus dubitat, ut loquar cum Auguſtino. Quid enim caro exanimis a trunco differt?* Whitak. De Origin. Peccato 3.1.

without the ſoul, neither the learned nor the unlearned doubts, that I may ſpeak with Auguſtine. For what doth the inanimate fleſh differ from a ſtock? And I hope the Biſhop will not ſay, *A block or a ſtock hath ſinne.* Moreover, after thouſands of ſinnes committed in the body, and by and with the body, yet the body ſeparated from the ſoul hath no ſinne, is not ſinfull, much leſſe is *ſinne*: and ſhall the ſeed in the wombe be called *ſinfull* or *ſinne*, as Kemnitius or Luther calleth it; before it is warmed with life or enlivened with a ſoul? Laſtly, in our very *Creed* conception is uſed with libertie and freedome; and not narrowly impriſoned: *Chriſt was conceived of the Holy Ghoſt, born of the Virgin Mary.* Where conception includeth in itſelf formation of the bodily parts, and unition of the ſoul: So *Eve conceived, and bare Cain,* Geneſ. 4. 1. *and Cain his wife conceived, and bare Chanoch,* verſ. 17. Again, Geneſ. 16. 11. the Angel ſaith to Hagar, *Concepiſti & paries filium: Thou art with childe,* ſaith our late Tranſlation, *and ſhalt bear a ſonne.* And uſually in the Scriptures there are onely made two degrees of mans nativitie. Firſt, conception, wrapping within its verge generation, with all degrees of formation, nutrition and augmentation. Secondly, birth or bringing forth. Whereupon they often runne in couplets together, *Concepit* & *Peperit*; where conception is extended unto our nativitie. Let this ſuffice againſt Biſhop Bilſon and his partiſans, Mollerus and others, *That conception is taken by Divines, in a full unreſtrained ſenſe.*

3. Let us now with Phyſicians ſay ſomewhat of conception, as it is taken natively, phyſically, properly, and formally. Though I never met with any who doth exactly ſet down the beginning, progreſſe, and end of conception, with its infallible bounds and limits of time, and wholy agrees with his fellows; yet out of their manifold diverſitie I have gathered enough to juſtifie, that conception is within a very ſhort time of coition, when it is impoſſible there ſhould be ſinne properly, unles the ſeed in the bodies of mankinde be ſinfull, or the ſoul be traducted by the ſeed; which Biſhop Bilſon juſtly explodeth. That which we call *conception*, Phyſicians call σύλληψιν which deſcendeth from συλλαμβάνειν which reception is in a ſhort time: then followeth permiſtion, whereupon * *The ſeed liveth no leſſe then a part of the mothers body: for by veſſels (which are receptacles) it is as ſtraitly ingrafted into the body of the mother, as a ſcience into the ſtock of a tree, which doth ſtill flouriſh and is full of life.* And Hippocrates calleth it ἔμψυχον for upon commiſtion is life: and this ſome do call *a conception.* Galen ſeems to make conception, one and the ſame with comprehenſion and retention. If ſo it be, ſince retention is immediately upon commiſtion, (if not before, or at it) conception cannot be long deferred. Laſtly, if conception be a diſtinct action from the receiving

* *Non minùs vivit ſemen, quàm quædam pars corporis materni; namque per cotylas (quæ ſunt acceptabula) corpori materni ſtrictè ſic inſeritur, ut arboris trunco ramus, qui viteſcit adhuc, & vitâ tenetur.*

ceiving attraction, and from the permiſtion of the attracted, and from the retention of the mingled or permixed: if conception be * *the vivification of the fruitfull ſeed to the ſhaping of the fruit*, and be the fourth ſeverall action of the wombe, as * Laurentius hath it: I ſay, grant all this; yet, ſince the diſtance of time between theſe actions is very ſhort, conception muſt needs be ſhortly *poſt coitum perfectum*. Some ſay, within ſeven houres; I ſay, almoſt preſently: but let him that doubteth have recourſe to Phyſicians, and to the excellent deſcription of conception made by the learned * Fernelius. For I will paſſe from this point; wherein you ſee, how great a difference there is between conception, as God in Holy Writ ſpeaketh of it, with Divines accordingly uſing the word; and as man deſcribeth it naturally: and I now come to ſpeak of abortives.

* *Vivificatio fœcundi ſeminis ad formandum fœtum.*

* Laurent. *Hiſtor. Anatom.* 8. 4.

* Fernel. *De Hominis Procreatione* 7. 8.

4 Job maketh two kindes of abortives; which the Latines alſo do curiouſly diſcern and diſtinguiſh by the ſeverall words *Aborſus* and *Abortus:* (the lofty and learned Bolducus is my Author) the former is more ſecret and kept cloſe, the latter expoſed more to ſight and knowledge: and if being ripe for birth, it die before, is called *Exterricinius* by Feſtus. The former is liveleſſe & formleſſe; the latter living, and formed before abortion: the former aborſed within 40 dayes upon conception; the latter, after diſtinguiſhable organization. *The aborſive had no images kept in remembrance of them*, (ſaith Lorinus on Eccleſiaſtes 6.3. as Bolducus on Job 3.16. citeth him) *the abortive had: the aborſive had no graves properly ſo called; but the abortive had. The former indeed were allowed a buriall place, though not properly a grave.* Fulgentius, *De Priſco Sermone*, ſaith, *The Ancients did call the places of infants buriall*, SUGGRUNDARIA. They could not call them *Buſta*, becauſe they had not bones which might be burnt; nor could they be named *Tumuli*, becauſe they were ſo ſmall, that the place did not *tumeſcere*. Therefore the Vulgat did not ſo aptly read it, Job 10.19. *Tranſlatus ad tumulum:* it had been more properly, *ad ſuggrundarium*. Our Engliſh late Tranſlation hath it, *To the grave*. And though the word and noun *Keber*, there uſed, cometh of the verb *Kabar*, which ſignifieth *ſepelire*, (ſome comparing it to its tranſpoſit and anagram *Rakab*, which ſignifieth to *rot*, or *putrifie*) and full often denoteth the ſepulchres and graves in the Holy Writ: yet, perhaps, it would better have ſorted to the ancient cuſtome of interring untimely births, if they had read it, *I ſhould have been carried from the wombe to my burying place*, and omitted the grave, as being the receptacle of greater bodies. Job wiſheth he had been like the firſt of theſe, Job 10.18. and ſaith of it, *I ſhould have been as though I had not been*, verſ. 19. Semblably, Job 3.16. *As an untimely birth I had not been*; and in reference to the ſpeedy, and ſecret removing it from out of ſight, Job there calleth

calleth it *an hidden untimely birth.* To the second sort Job wisheth he had been like, Job 3.11. *Why died I not from the wombe?* (as our late Translatours have it, agreeable to the Hebrew, word for word) but the sense is hit by the Septuagint, ἐν κοιλίᾳ, and the Vulgat, *In utero.* To which second sort also the Preacher pointeth, Ecclesiastes 6.3. saying thus, *If a man beget an hundred children, and live many yeares, ----- and his soul be not filled with good, and also that he have no buriall, I say, an untimely birth is better then he.* If any one wonder, why Job desired to be like each of the untimely births, and why Solomon should preferre an abortive before an unburied churl: when David curseth his enemies with this curse of God, Psal. 58.8. *Let them be like the untimely birth of a woman, that may not see the sun:* (which indeed is an heavy imprecation, as may appeare by the rest of the curse unfolded in these similitudes, *Break out the great teeth of the young lions, ô Lord,* vers.6. and vers.7. *Let them melt away as waters, which runne continually: when he bendeth his bow, to shoot his arrows, let them be as cut in pieces;* and vers.8. *As a snail which melteth, let every one of them passe away*) you are to know, that *Job did it* ἐκ τῶ πάθους, saith Tremellius; *and the Preacher, ex ratione carnis,* saith the same; that is, (as I interpret him) *out of carnall reasoning:* he might rather have said, *ratione carnis,* because the flesh of the abortive was buried, and the churls carcase unburied. Nor let any man thwart me, by saying, that in the Septuagint is no such matter; but the words are, Ἔπεσε πῦρ (ἐπ' ἀυτὸς) and the Vulgat accordeth, *Supercecidit ignis,* and the whole troups both of Greek and Latine Fathers so read it, and so expound it: I answer ingenuously, that (ascribing so much as I do to the Septuagint and Vulgat) I wondred, how there should be so great difference from the uncorrupt originall. The Vulgat (thought I) trusted to the 70. and the 70. to some Hebrew Copy varying from others more perfect. The 70 rendred, Gen. 4.8. not according to the Hebrew *(which is certainly defective,* saith Vatablus, *and somewhat is to be understood;* for indeed there is an extraordinary pause) but according to the Samaritan Pentateuch, Cain said unto his brother, *Let us go into the field,* as Mr. Selden evinceth by the authority of Hierom and Cyrill of old, and by a Samaritan Copy, now in the hands of Bishop Usher: which the Hierusalem Targum amplifieth, relating, *That Cain told Abel there was no future world, nor reward for goodnesse, nor punishment for sinne: all which Abel contradicted; and thereupon Cain slew him:* So might the 70. or the Vulgat, or both, translate the passage of the Psalmist, not accordant to those Copies which are now in price, but answerable to some other Hebrew one. At length I rested assured, that the Copies which they used, differed onely in one letter, and in the points. For in stead of בַּל with five points (as it is most commonly read) and

ceiving attraction, and from the permiſtion of the attracted, and from the retention of the mingled or permixed: if conception be * *the vivification of the fruitfull ſeed to the ſhaping of the fruit*, and be the fourth ſeverall action of the wombe, as * Laurentius hath it: I ſay, grant all this; yet, ſince the diſtance of time between theſe actions is very ſhort, conception muſt needs be ſhortly *poſt coitum perfectum*. Some ſay, within ſeven houres; I ſay, almoſt preſently: but let him that doubteth have recourſe to Phyſicians, and to the excellent deſcription of conception made by the learned * Fernelius. For I will paſſe from this point; wherein you ſee, how great a difference there is between conception, as God in Holy Writ ſpeaketh of it, with Divines accordingly uſing the word; and as man deſcribeth it naturally: and I now come to ſpeak of abortives.

* *Vivificatio fœcundi ſeminis ad formandum fœtum.*

* Laurent. *Hiſtor. Anatom.* 8.4.

* Fernel. *De Hominis Procreatione* 7. 8.

4 Job maketh two kindes of abortives; which the Latines alſo do curiouſly diſcern and diſtinguiſh by the ſeverall words *Aborſus* and *Abortus:* (the lofty and learned Bolducus is my Author) the former is more ſecret and kept cloſe, the latter expoſed more to ſight and knowledge: and if being ripe for birth, it die before, is called *Exterricinius* by Feſtus. The former is liveleſſe & formleſſe; the latter living, and formed before abortion: the former aborſed within 40 dayes upon conception; the latter, after diſtinguiſhable organization. *The aborſive had no images kept in remembrance of them*, (ſaith Lorinus on Eccleſiaſtes 6.3. as Bolducus on Job 3.16. citeth him) *the abortive had: the aborſive had no graves properly ſo called; but the abortive had. The former indeed were allowed a buriall place, though not properly a grave.* Fulgentius, *De Priſco Sermone*, ſaith, *The Ancients did call the places of infants buriall*, SUGGRUNDARIA. They could not call them *Buſta*, becauſe they had not bones which might be burnt; nor could they be named *Tumuli*, becauſe they were ſo ſmall, that the place did not *tumeſcere*. Therefore the Vulgat did not ſo aptly read it, Job 10.19. *Tranſlatus ad tumulum:* it had been more properly, *ad ſuggrundarium*. Our Engliſh late Tranſlation hath it, *To the grave*. And though the word and noun *Keber*, there uſed, cometh of the verb *Kabar*, which ſignifieth *ſepelire*, (ſome comparing it to its tranſpoſit and anagram *Rakab*, which ſignifieth to *rot*, or *putrifie*) and full often denoteth the ſepulchres and graves in the Holy Writ: yet, perhaps, it would better have ſorted to the ancient cuſtome of interring untimely births, if they had read it, *I ſhould have been carried from the wombe to my burying place*, and omitted the grave, as being the receptacle of greater bodies. Job wiſheth he had been like the firſt of theſe, Job 10.18. and ſaith of it, *I ſhould have been as though I had not been*, verſ. 19. Semblably, Job 3.16. *As an untimely birth I had not been*; and in reference to the ſpeedy, and ſecret removing it from out of ſight, Job there calleth

calleth it *an hidden untimely birth.* To the second sort Job wisheth he had been like, Job 3.11. *Why died I not from the wombe?* (as our late Translatours have it, agreeable to the Hebrew, word for word) but the sense is hit by the Septuagint, ἐν κοιλίᾳ, and the Vulgat, *In utero.* To which second sort also the Preacher pointeth, Ecclesiastes 6.3. saying thus, *If a man beget an hundred children, and live many yeares, ----- and his soul be not filled with good, and also that he have no buriall, I say, an untimely birth is better then he.* If any one wonder, why Job desired to be like each of the untimely births, and why Solomon should preferre an abortive before an unburied churl: when David curseth his enemies with this curse of God, Psal.58.8. *Let them be like the untimely birth of a woman, that may not see the sun:* (which indeed is an heavy imprecation, as may appeare by the rest of the curse unfolded in these similitudes, *Break out the great teeth of the young lions, ô Lord,* vers.6. and vers.7. *Let them melt away as waters, which runne continually: when he bendeth his bow, to shoot his arrows, let them be as cut in pieces;* and vers.8. *As a snail which melteth, let every one of them passe away*) you are to know, that *Job did it* ἐκ τῶν παθῶν, saith Tremellius; *and the Preacher, ex ratione carnis,* saith the same; that is, (as I interpret him) *out of carnall reasoning:* he might rather have said, *ratione carnis,* because the flesh of the abortive was buried, and the churls carcase unburied. Nor let any man thwart me, by saying, that in the Septuagint is no such matter; but the words are, Ἔπεσε πῦρ (ἐπ' ἀνδ.) and the Vulgat accordeth, *Supercecidit ignis,* and the whole troups both of Greek and Latine Fathers so read it, and so expound it: I answer ingenuously, that (ascribing so much as I do to the Septuagint and Vulgat) I wondred, how there should be so great difference from the uncorrupt originall. The Vulgat (thought I) trusted to the 70. and the 70. to some Hebrew Copy varying from others more perfect. The 70 rendred, Gen. 4.8. not according to the Hebrew (*which is certainly defective,* saith Vatablus, *and somewhat is to be understood*; for indeed there is an extraordinary pause) but according to the Samaritan Pentateuch, Cain said unto his brother, *Let us go into the field,* as Mr. Selden evinceth by the authority of Hierom and Cyrill of old, and by a Samaritan Copy, now in the hands of Bishop Usher: which the Hierusalem Targum amplifieth, relating, *That Cain told Abel there was no future world, nor reward for goodnesse, nor punishment for sinne: all which Abel contradicted; and thereupon Cain slew him:* So might the 70. or the Vulgat, or both, translate the passage of the Psalmist, not accordant to those Copies which are now in price, but answerable to some other Hebrew one. At length I rested assured, that the Copies which they used, differed onely in one letter, and in the points. For instead of בְּנֵי with five points (as it is most commonly read) and

with ſix points, ſaith Kimchi, (which ſignifieth *abortivus*, and is in the Pſalmiſt) their Copies had it נָפַל, which ſignifieth *cecidit*, there being the ſame Radicals, and no letter changed. Secondly, for אֵשֶׁת, *mulieris*, which is in David, they read אֵשׁ, which ſignifieth *fire*: the omiſſion onely of one letter ת, hath cauſed *abortivus mulieris* to be tranſlated *cecidit ignis*. For as for the variety of punctations, that is of ſmall moment, by reaſon of their often interchangings and eaſie miſtakings; and points were not uſed in the dayes of the Septuagint, (as ſome ſay) ſcarce when the Vulgat firſt was, (as others ſay) not from the beginning (ſay I) if the names of the points and accents be Syriacall. Druſius in his Henoch, chap. 1. ſaith, *Hieronymus ante Maſoritarum tempora, à quibus apices habemus (ut communis opinio eſt) qui nunc in vſu, vixit.* Mercer in the great Dictionary of Pagnine, on the word אָבַר relates, that when the Chaldee tranſlates, Deuter. 26. 5. *Laban Syrus quærebat perdere patrem meum*, and when the Vulgat rendred it, *Syrus perſequebatur patrem meum* (whereas indeed it ought to be read, as it is in our laſt Tranſlation, *A Syrian ready to periſh was my father*) *non eſt dubium* (ſaith he) *quin ſine punctis, quibus tunc carebant Biblia, legerint in Pihel, non in Kal.* Yea, *Sine dubio novas literas habemus*; if we may beleeve Bellarmine, *De Verbo Dei*, 1. 1.

And indeed, the three *fundamenta* laid by Balthaſar Bambach, That the points were coëtaneall to the Hebrew letters, are founded on the ſands. Firſt, ſaith he, *Sine vocalibus conſonantes proferri non poſſunt, & omnis lingua, quæ illis deſtituta eſt, manca, imperfecta, & mutila efficitur.* What of all this? how followeth this, *Becauſe the conſonants cannot be pronounced without vowells; therefore the vowells were underwritten?* Let him know, the Hebrew Tongue was moſt perfect, when it was leaſt written, and till Moſes his time there were not ſo much as conſonants written; (howſoever they fable of a *pillar* written upon long before) for God invented the *letters* firſt, when he made his *Two Tables*, and writ the *Law* in them. See this proved by our learned Whitaker, ſaying, * *God himſelf hath ſhewed an example and manner of writing, when he delivered to Moſes the Law written with his own fingers. So Chryſoſtom and Theophylact write on the firſt of Matthew, and the Papiſts in their Confeſſion, &c.* But though Euſebius, *Præparat. Evangel.* lib. 18. ſaith, *Moſes firſt taught the uſe of letters to the Jews*, yet Saint Auguſtine, *De Civitate* 15. 23, ſaith, Enoch wrote * *ſome divine things*; ſince Saint Jude teſtifieth ſo much. But that ever honoured Father conſidered not, that Jude ſaid onely *Enoch propheſied*, which he might do by ſaying onely, and not writing; as Adam, Geneſ. 2. 24. yea God himſelf propheſied of Chriſt in Paradiſe, Geneſ. 3. 15, which Moſes firſt wrote (for ought that we know:) and S. Judes words are,

Enoch

Deus ipſe ſcribendi exemplum, modúmq; oſtendit, quando Legem ſuis digitis conſcriptam Moſi tradidit. Sic Chryſoſt. & Theophylact. in 1 Matth. & Papiſtæ in confeſſ. Petrocovienſi, cap. 15, & Screckius Jeſuita, Theſ. 13, De Verbo Dei; Whitak. De Script. Controverſ. 1. quæſt. cap 2.

Nonnulla divina.

Enoch propheſied, ſaying; in which writing is rather excluded then included. Druſius in his Enoch cap. 27, ſaith, *There was a book called* LIBER BELLORUM DOMINI, *out of which Moſes bringeth a teſtimony*. Cornelius à Lapide ſaith, *It was written before the Pentateuch*. Aben Ezra ſaith, *The book was in the dayes of Abraham*. In the book of Job, who lived before Moſes, is mention of *writing*, and of *books*, as of things common, and of *graving in ſtone with a pen of iron*. Cuſanus prinketh higher: in his *Compend*, chap. 3. pag. 241. he ſaith, *Our firſt parents had the art of writing; ſince by it man hath many helps; for things paſt and abſent are by it made preſent*. By the ſame reaſon he may ſay, *Adam knew the art of Printing, of Brachygraphy, of Characters*. Let us paſſe-by the unauthorized vaſt fancy of Cuſanus, and anſwer the objection drawn from Jobs book: which if it were written by his three friends, or *their Scribes, at their dictate*, as ſaith Bolducus the Carthuſian (ſince they could make Job no better ſatisfaction then to hiſtorifie his innocency, and their own petulancy) or if by Elihu the Buzite (as is very probable: for he was young when they were old, Job 32.6. and might well live till after the writing of the Pentateuch, and publiſhing of books) or by Job himſelf, for *Job himſelf might have conferred in Midian with Moſes*, ſaith Bolducus; *who alſo died but thirteen yeares before Moſes died*, ſaith that Carthuſian: yea Job lived after Moſes, if he lived 248 yeares (as the Septuagint and Olympiodorus do account.) And certainly, after all Jobs miſery, he lived in proſperity 20 yeares longer then the whole yeares of Moſes (compare Job 42.16. with Deuter. 33. 7.) and ſo Job might know the writing of the Law in Tables of ſtone, and the other Sacred Writings of Moſes; perhaps alſo books of other men, to which he alluded; and yet there was no writing before the Law. Concerning the book, Numb. 21.14. ſuppoſe the word runne in the preſent tenſe, *Dicitur, It is ſaid in the book of the Warres of the Lord*; yet it is expounded by the Chaldee as of a thing paſt, *What God did in the Red Sea, and in the brooks of Arnon*; which latter clauſe neceſſarily implyeth, that the book was written after the Law; for *The battle of Arnon was the fourtieth yeare after their Exodus*, ſaith a Jew, by Vatablus his commendation, very eminent. Or ſay it be read (as Robert Stephen, in his Annotations on the Pentateuch, gathered from the Kings Profeſſours at Paris, hath it) *Sicut fecit in Mari Rubro, ſic faciet in torrentibus Arnon*, which ſenſe Cornelius à Lapide embraceth; yet thoſe words evince, that the book was written ſince their going out of Egypt, *which was but fourty dayes before the giving of the Law*, ſaith Helvicus. But indeed, firſt, the word *Sepher* doth not alwayes ſignifie a book, but ſometimes a Narrative of things paſt; whereupon Tremellius readeth it, *Idcirco dici ſolet*, IN RECENSIONE BELLORUM JEHOVÆ: And *ſo others have*

held, ſaith Vatablus; plainly denying, that there was ever any ſuch eſpeciall book of warres. Others read it in the future, *It ſhall be read*; and thereupon ſome of the Jews think it is the Book of Judges, which handleth the Warre with Amalek; or another book which recounted the miracles of God in the Red Sea, and by the river Arnon: which book, perhaps, is now periſhed, as divers others of the holy Scriptures; and amongſt them, a book made by Samuel, 1 Samuel 10.25. Which I wondred that neither Druſius, nor any who handled the controverſies, whom I could yet meet with, ever obſerved before me. And indeed Jeamar is the future tenſe, *It ſhall be ſaid*, or, *it ſhall be written*. So Vatablus, the Interlineary, Eugubinus, and the Genevians. So the words are rather propheticall then hiſtoricall: and ſo no particular book of the warres of the Lord was written before the two Tables. Laſtly, that I may leave no objection unanſwered, adde this to the anſwer of S. Auguſtine, That Chriſt, ſpeaking of a propheſie in Paradiſe concerning himſelf, doth not ſay, *It was written before Moſes*, but, *It is written by Moſes of me*, John 5.46. Moreover, if we can read the Hebrew now without vowels, much eaſier and better could they whoſe daily ſpeech it was. The neceſſity of pronouncing the conſonāts by the vowels, evinceth not the writing of conſonāts; the neceſſity of writing the Hebrew tongue by conſonants evinceth not the neceſſity of writing vowels: they may be of a later invention.

Secondly, ſaith he, * *Seeing that the two tongues, the Syriack and the Arabick, which came from the Hebrew, have vowels, as it appeares out of manuſcripts and printed books, it is not likely that the Mother-tongue, to wit the Hebrew, wants them.* I anſwer it followeth not, *Becauſe the Syriack & Arabick have now points; therefore they had ever ſo when they were written*: and if they had ever points, it is likely they invented them, and added them to their conſonants, the rather becauſe the Hebrew wanted them.

Thirdly, * *We muſt needs hold that tongue to be certain, and no way ambiguous or doubtfull, in which God hath publiſhed his ſacred Oracles.* I anſwer, Then God ſhould have writ in any other language: for the Hebrew, of all other is moſt dubious and ambiguous. And whereas he addeth, *That the Hebrew without vowels hath no certain ſignification, but from the antecedent and conſequent; and admitteth three, foure, or five ſignifications, according to the diverſity of vowels*: I anſwer, the antecedents and conſequents are guides ſufficient, and God did it purpoſely to exerciſe our wits, and to make us know, that though in things neceſſary to ſalvation the Scripture is eaſy, yet in ſome matters there are depths not to be ſounded; in others, *The lips of the Prieſt ſhould keep knowledge, and they ſhould ſeek the law at his mouth*, Malach. 2.7. which the unlearned ſcorn now adayes to do; though there be much ambiguitie: but how bold-daring, ſelf-

*Quum duæ linguæ Syriaca & Arabica, quæ ab Hebræa ortæ ſunt, vocales habeant, ut ex libris manuſcriptis & impreſſis apparet; Matrem ueropè Hebræam, illis carere veriſimile non eſt.

*Quâ Linguâ Deus Sacra ſua oracula promulgavit, hanc certam minimèq; ambiguam eſſe neceſſariò ſtatuendum eſt.

ſelf-willed would they be, if there were no difficulties?

I return from the words to the matter, and ſay, That as the ſtrong births of the wombe are a bleſſing of God, whether in women, or in beaſts, Deuter. 30. 9. So an abortion is a curſe, and abortives (I mean that had life and reaſonable ſouls) by the ordinary rules of Geneſ. 17. 14. when Circumciſion was in force; and of John 3.3. whileſt Baptiſme is in force, is a fearfull eſtate. Howſoever God may diſpenſe with his own Law, and ſhew mercy extraordinarily; yet David, when he wiſhed his enemies to be like abortives, wiſhed them no good, but evill: yea, if he did not curſe them, but foretold what they ſhould be like; and that they were not the words of imprecation, but prediction; yet he did not fore-divine, or fore-propheſie any good eſtate to them, whom he likeneth to abortives. Let this ſuffice concerning *abortives*, incapable of ſinne or puniſhment; and *abortives*, whoſe eſtate of ſoul is dangerous, being meaſured by the rules of precepts. Which I ſay againſt Anabaptiſts, and the contemners or cauſeleſſe delayers of that gracious Sacrament.

5 It is now ſuppoſed, and ſhall (if it pleaſe God) hereafter be demonſtrated, *That humane ſouls are not traducted, nor cauſally brought out of the fleſh*: yet are they occaſionally, (that I may touch at the manner) God having reſolved and decreed, after generation and fit organization of the Embryo, to create and infuſe a reaſonable ſoul: which ſoul, becauſe it is united to a maſſe corrupted, in ſuch a manner as a ſpiritleſſe maſſe may be corrupted, or rather to a maſſe inclining or inducing to corruption, in the very unition it contracteth originall ſinne. Hugo Eterianus thus deſcanteth on this point, * *When the ſoul languiſheth, it is neither caſt down by the will, nor by neceſsity, but onely by fellowſhip, if the ſoul were corrupted by the will, it ſhould not be counted originall ſinne, but actuall: if it ſhould fall by neceſsitie, that vice were no further to be imputed.* Concerning the latter part, I anſwer, if in his *neceſsity* he imply coaction, he ſaith true: otherwiſe, by this concurrence of our condeſcending will in Adam, or by our own implicit will, we may draw on us a neceſſitie of after-ſinning, which moſt juſtly may be imputed to us, and we may tie our ſelves with our own bonds. To the former part this may give ſatisfaction, That againſt the will of the ſoul, the ſoul it ſelf can not be corrupted: for then the will ſhould be forced, and ſo no will at all, but *Noluntas*, and not *Voluntas*. *It is not neceſſary*, ſaith Bellarmine, *that our ſoul muſt needs come from Adam, becauſe we draw ſinne from him: if but one part come from him it is enough.* For a father doth not *per ſe* produce originall ſinne in the childe, but *per accidens*; namely, as by the act of generation it cometh to paſſe, that his ſonne is a member of mankinde, which

Cum anima languore afficitur, non voluntate, non neceſſitate, ſed ſolâ ſocietate percellitur: ſi voluntate corrumperetur animas non originale, ſed actuale peccatum cenſeretur: ſi neceſſitate caderet, non ulrà eſſet imputandum illud vitium, Hugo Eter. de Animarum regreſſu ab Inferis cap. 4.

was overtaken in Adams corruption, and that the propenſion unto evill of the earthly part traducted, meeting with a ſoul not much reſiſting, cauſeth this originall ſinne to reſult thencefrom, and death by this original ſinne. So that no ſooner is the ſoul united to its body, and the matter glewed to the form, but the infant deſerveth to be, and is the childe of death, by reaſon of the primigeneall corruption. If you enquire after what manner the body worketh the ſoul unto this evill; we may truly ſay, * *The body worketh not upon the ſoul by a naturall and immediate action.* You heard what Hugo Eterianus ſaid, *It is ſtricken or caſt down onely by fellowſhip.* He enlargeth himſelf in the ſame Chapter, thus, * *Imperfection, languiſhing, and corruption abide in the fleſh before the ſouls conjunction; from which diſeaſe the ſoul is infected: as if a veſſel be tainted with an ill odour, it infects therewith whatſoever liquour it receiveth.* Gerſon thus, * *The ſoul by the conjunction with the body contracteth that infection; as when one falleth into the mire, he is beſmeared and ſtained.* Feliſius thus, * *A clean apple put in an unclean hand is ſoiled. Good wine poured into a fuſtie veſſel contracts a ſtrange taſte, and loſes its own naturall: ſo the ſoul loſes its naturall vigour, when it is united in the fleſh.* Another thus, *Anima cum labente ſimul labitur, & fruſtra nititur dum innititur.* To the ſame effect another ſaith thus, *As the pureſt rain-water falling on duſt, is turned with the duſt into a lump of mire: ſo at the coadunation of the ſoul unto the earthly part, both ſpirit and fleſh are plunged in the durt of corruption.* Auguſtine againſt Julian the Pelagian, 4.15. preferreth the very Heathen before Julian; for he held, *That nothing was conveyed unto us from Adam*; and they held, * *That we were born to be puniſhed for old crimes committed in a former life.* And, ſaith Auguſtine, *it is true which Ariſtotle relateth, That we are puniſhed like to thoſe who fell among the Hetrurian robbers, * Whoſe living bodies being coupled face to face with dead mens carcaſes, were ſo killed.* Of the Hetrurian Tyrant Mezentius Virgil, Æneid. 8. recordeth the like;

Mortua corporibus jungebat corpora vivis,
Componens manibúſque manus atque oribus ora,
(Tormenti genus) & ſanie tabóque fluentes,
Complexu in miſero, longâ ſic morte necabat.

But I return from this Digreſſion. The Heathen ſay (as S. Auguſtine relateth) * *That our ſouls united to our bodies are like the living coupled with the dead. They ſaw ſomewhat*, ſaith he, and commendeth their wiſedome in diſcerning the miſeries of mankinde to be for ſomewhat before committed, & in acknowledging the power and juſtice of God; though without divine revelation they could not know, that it was Adams offence which brought ſuch a wrack both on our ſouls and on our bodies.

* *Corpus non agit in animam actione phyſicâ & immediatâ.*

* *Vitium & languor & corruptio ante animæ conjunctionem in carne perſiſtunt, ex qua tabe anima maculatur; ſicut ſi teſta odore malo imbuta ſit, quemcunq; liquorem ſuſceperit, ſuâ corruptione inficit.*

* *Anima ex conjunctione ad corpus contrahit illud vitium; ſicut quandoquis cadit in lutum, fœdatur & maculatur.* Gerſ. in Compend Theolog.

* *Pomum mundum in manu immunda poſitum fœdatur. Vinum bonum tranſfuſum in vas acetoſum, ſuum naturalem perdendo ſaporem contrahit alienum: ſic anima, quando incepit eſſe in carne inita, ſuum naturalem amittit vigorem.*

* *Nos ob antiqua ſcelera ſuſcepta in vita ſuperiore, pœnarum luendarum cauſâ eſſe natos.*

* *Quorum corpora viva cum mortuis, adverſa adverſis accommodata, quàm aptiſſimè colligabantur & nectebantur.*

* *Noſtros animos cum corporibus copulatos, ut vivos cum mortuis eſſe conjunctos.*

What

What hath been hitherto related, ſeemeth too much to encline to the naturall, phyſicall, immediate working of the ſoul upon the body. Others are as faultie, who ſay, *The ſoul receiveth no annoyance from the body, but by way of* IMPEDITION *onely, where the ſpirituall faculties are hindered, and the Muſick ſpilt, by reaſon of the untuneablenes of the organes.* But they wil not ſeem to heare, *That a ſpirituall ſubſtance can receive infection from a nature corporeall.* Both opinions may reſt contented in the middeſſe or mean, That as the body cannot go beyond the ſphere of its activitie, and work properly and phyſically upon the ſoul: ſo by the interpoſition, as it were, of a middle nature, the body not onely hindereth the faculties of the ſoul from working, but ſometimes worketh upon the ſoul. Thus the naturall, vitall, and animall ſpirits do binde and unite the ſoul to the body, that neither part can part from other, though it would. Thus bodily objects work on the minde, but it is by the mediation of the outward and inward ſenſes. Shall corporeall, outward, and remote objects, by degrees, draw the ſoul into ſinne, even in our perfect age, when our naturall reaſon is moſt vigorous; and may not the corrupted ſeed, having as great a propenſion to evill as Naphtha to take fire, at the conjunction infect the ſoul with a participation of uncleannes, though the operation be not phyſicall, or immediate? By Adams ſoul ſinning was Adams fleſh infected; may not our ſoul be infected as well by our fleſh? A ſpirituall ſubſtance can produce a bodily effect. Boëtius ſaith excellently, *Forms materiall came from forms immateriall: Our will was moved by our intellect, our appetite by our will, and a bodily change conformable to our appetite.* And may not a *bodily ſpecies* work by the ſame degrees, backward, on the ſoul it ſelf? The reaſon is alike in the contrarietie. Doth the corporeall fire of Hell torment and affect the incorporeall ſpirits of evil Angels, and ſhall it of wicked men, (as moſt certainly it doth and muſt; which ſhall be proved, God willing, otherwhere) and may not the matter make ſome impreſſion on the form, the body upon the ſoul, when there is ſuch a ſympathie in nature betwixt them? If the ſoul do no way ſuffer from the body, how doth it follow the temperature of the body? How doth madnes, fooliſhnes, anger, and love, with other affections, work upon the minde? Yea, how cometh it to paſſe, that not onely ſtrength and nimblenes of body, but even goodnes of wit is propagated, (if nature be ſtrong) and children reſemble their fathers both in manners and underſtanding? The fleſh it ſelf without the ſoul, if it be beaten, hurt, or cut, is no way ſenſible. Reunite the ſeparated ſoul to the wronged body, the ſoul feeleth, and is much affected: nor is the grief in the inciſion onely, but in the ſoul. Yea, in apoplexies and deep ſleeps, caſt upon men by ſtupefactive ingredients and compounded by art,

while

while the ſoul is in the body, wounds have been given unto the earthy part, and it never felt them: when thoſe fits are vaniſhed, the ſoul feels the pain of the diſcontinuity, and diviſion of the fleſh, as well as the body. Doctor* Rainolds thus, *God by nature hath ordered, that the ſoul naturally united to the body,* * *Should ſuffer with the body, and be grieved the body being afflicted, and rejoice it being refreſhed, and be ſorrowfull the body being killed; ſo that ſome way it ſuffers by reaſon of the body.* Permit me but the uſe of his modification, *ſome way*, and I dare ſay, The body drawes the ſoul *its way, ſome way* to ſinne. Aquinas on Rom. 5. Lect. 3. *It ſhould not ſeem, that ſinne which is an accident of the ſoul, can be produced by the originall of the fleſh: It is anſwered* (ſaith he) *with reaſon. Though the ſoul be not in the ſeed, yet there is in the ſeed a vertue diſpoſing the body to receive the ſoul, which ſoul being poured or infuſed into the body, is after a ſort conformable to the body, becauſe every thing received is in the receiver according to the capacitie of the receiver.* To him let me adde, If a new created ſoul ſhould be put into a body not deſcending from Adam, it ſhould not have originall ſinne; but meeting with a body diſpoſed to corruption, after its kinde it yeeldeth, and contracteth originall ſinne.

*Prælect. 51. De Libris Apocryphis.

*Compatiatur corpori, & affiſto corpore vexetur, & recreato exhilaretur, & corpore occiſo condoleſcat; ut quodam modo ratione corporis patiatur.

6. Yea, but the act of Adams ſinne paſſed quickly away, and the guiltines was forgiven; how could it infect us? I anſwer, * *The perſon did firſt infect the nature, afterwards the nature did infect the perſon.* The ſpeedy gliding act poiſoned our nature; and we have not uncorrupted Adams nature, or any part of it; but his corrupt nature propagated corrupteth our perſons. The forgivenes of that his guilt and ſinne joyned with ſubſequent holines of life, is no priviledge of innocency to his poſterity; who were not made of his perfect, but vitiated nature. Accordingly ſince that time, they who are cleanſed with the laver of regeneration, ſealed with the ſpirit, juſtifyed by faith, preſented blameleſſe to God by Chriſt, precious in the eyes of the Lord, juſt among men, elect, and pure; even ſuch do beget children over whom this gangren of corruption creepeth, and the babes are infected with originall ſinne. If it be objected, *If the root be holy, ſo are the branches*, Rom. 11. 16. therefore holy mens children are better in their generation, then wicked mens children: I anſwer, the fallacie is in the word *Holy*, which in the place to the Romanes ſignifieth not inward holines in the ſight of God, but outward holines, whereby they might be diſtinguiſhed from other prophane people. Thus the wicked Jews were as holy as the righteous Abraham, even the traytour Judas himſelf. If any further inſiſt and alledge, *The children of a beleever are holy*, 1. Cor. 7. 14. It is alſo truly further anſwered, That the ſame word *Holy* is homonymous; not being all one with juſtified, regenerate, exempt or free

*Perſona primùm infecit naturam, pòſt natura infecit perſonam.

or free from ſinne: but they are ſaid to be *holy*, in regard of the communion with the Church, for that covenant ſake, *I will be thy God, and the God of thy ſeed.* So *Holines ſignifieth a relation, not a qualitie*, ſaith * Scharpius. Auguſtine thus, * *As a wilde olive-tree is brought forth out of the ſeed of a wilde olive-tree, and out of the ſeed of an olive-tree nothing but a wilde olive-tree, although there be a great difference between a wilde olive-tree and an olive-tree.* The ſeed both of the wilde-olive, and alſo of the garden, true, good olive-tree bringeth forth a wilde-olive: ſo a ſinner is begotten of the fleſh of a ſinner, and alſo of the fleſh of a righteous man, though there is a great difference between a ſinner and a juſt perſon. Haſt thou ground fallowed, manured, fit to be ſowen? haſt thou ſeed of the beſt, picked, winnowed, or tried? is it clear from tares, chaffe, or duſt? though thou haſt thy deſire for a ſeaſonable time of ſowing, though the heavens drop fatnes, and the earth conſpireth with them to yeeld thee a plentifull and good crop; yet ſhall thy corn ariſe, grow up, and be reaped with weeds, at leaſt with husk, chaffe, and duſt: ſo doth a juſt man beget an unjuſt, *Chriſtianus non Chriſtianum, A Chriſtian an Unchriſtian*; the circumciſed Hebrews beget children uncircumciſed: for the generation is naturall, and not ſpirituall. Wicked Ahaz begat good Hezekiah, wicked Ammon good Joſiah; good, not by generation, but regeneration. Thoſe wicked Fathers had no more priviledge then juſt Lot, who begat wicked daughters; or David, who had Abſalom; or Abraham, who had Iſmael; or Iſaac, who had Eſau; or Noah, who had Ham; or, to winde it up to the higheſt, Adam, whoſe firſt-begotten was the accurſed Cain. A whole family may be bound to ſome ſpeciall ſervice, for ſome diſloyalty they have ſhewed to their King. If the King be ſo gracious as to make proclamation, That whoſoever in a battell fighteth valiantly ſhall be himſelf freed from ſuch ſervitude and bounden ſervice; ſhall his children expect to be freed likewiſe? Perſonall acceptance is no neceſſary ſigne of generall ſucceſſive manumiſſion. We betrayed God for a little pleaſure. Thoſe that fight a good fight under Chriſt, are freed: yet do the children of the juſt grone under that yoke, out of which their fathers by ſpeciall grace have plucked their necks. Yea, but he ſinneth not that is begotten; for neither body is framed, nor ſoul united: he ſinneth not that begetteth, for the bed is undefiled; and in matrimony the act of generation lawfull, yea commanded, yea *meritorious*, ſay ſome of the School: He ſinneth not alſo that createth the ſoul. *By what crany, crank, or chink ſhall originall ſinne creep in? It was the objection of Julian the Pelagian*, ſaith Auguſtine: who anſwereth, * *Why do you ſeek a ſecret chink, ſith you have an open doore? for according to the Apoſtle, By one man ſinne entred.* And the manner how the ſoul is made ſinfull, is deſcribed at large before,

* *Sanctitas ſignificat relationem, non qualitatem.* Scharp. Curſ. Theol. pag. 461.

* *Sicut gignitur ex oleaſtri ſemine oleaſter, & ex oleæ ſemine non niſi oleaſter, cùm inter oleaſtrum & oleam plurimum diſtet.* Aug. *De Nuptiis & Concupiſcentia* l. 19. & 2. 34.

* *Quid queris latentem rimam, cùm habeas apertiſſimam januam? Nam ſecundum Apoſtolum, Per unum hominem peccatum intrevit.* Aug. *De Nuptiis & Concupiſc.* 2. 28.

before, to wit, That by the union it is infected, and ſo ſoon as it is infuſed it taſteth of corruption. But this ſeems ſtrange, if not impoſſible, That the ſoul, ſo ſoon as it is tied to the body, ſhould be caught like a bird with a lime-buſh, and bound up in corruption as in a bundle. Let him that objecteth, remember the Angels, higher of nature then men: Created they were in the truth, but *they did not abide in the truth*, John 8.44. *God found no ſtedfaſtnes in the Angels*, Job 4.18. Did not *Satan fall like lightning from heaven?* or rather according to the Greek, *Satan fell from heaven like lightning*, Luke 10.18. and lightning is gone, ere we can ſay, it is come. *The Angels kept not their firſt eſtate, but left their own habitations*, Jude, verſ. 6. Do not ſome of the School ſay, *They fell the ſecond inſtant of their creation?* and Aquine and his fellows maintain, it was * *preſently after the firſt inſtant?* So that what Seneca ſaid of the burning of Lyons, * *I am longer in telling thee that it periſhed, then it was in periſhing*, we may well apply to the evil Angels not ſtanding, or beginning to fall. And (alas!) what a ſhort time was there between Adams perfection, and imperfection? how ſuddenly did he conceive, and bring forth corruption? So quickly doth the ſoul of a young childe ſink under corruption, though it be not ſpeedily diſcerned. The ſeed of a ſtote, fox, or ſerpent, hath dangerous and deſperate inclinations in it, though they break not forth long after. For as in the dark night you can not difference, diſtinguiſh, or know the blindnes of a blinde mans eye, from the eye of him who is not blinde; but when the light cometh, it is eaſily diſcerned: ſo in infants originall ſinne appeareth not, but in proceſſe of time it groweth manifeſt. Humours putrifying and putrified are long in the body, ere they come to their height, and ſhew themſelves outwardly: ſo is ſinne in the ſoul of every childe; it lurketh in our nature, which was derived unto us from our Fore-fathers. Yet let me not be miſtaken, as if I held, that we are anſwerable for the ſinnes of our Fore-fathers, or that Adams future ſinnes, after his firſt ſinne and fall, were propagated, or the iniquities of any other our immediat, mediat, or remote progenitours ſhall lie heavy on us. For man begetteth man like to himſelf, as he is *Species hominis*, not as he is *Individuum*: and Accidents belonging to the individuall perſon of the Father paſſe not over to the childe, but thoſe things that pertain to the ſpecificall nature. Therefore what belongeth to man, as he is *Individuum*, he doth not propagate. As for example, A Muſician begetteth not a Muſician, but a man; an Aſtrologer an earthly, a wiſeman a fool, a Divine a carnall, a holy man an unclean perſon. Should we propagate as we are *Individua*, we ſhould alſo convey, and communicate to our poſteritie our knowledge, our arts, our ſciences, and our Fathers holy inclinations, and mortified diſpoſitions. For good is more diffuſive

* *Statim poſt primum inſtans.*
* *Diutiùs illam tibi periiſſe, quàm periit, narro.* Sen. Epiſt. 91.

diffusive and spreading of it self, then evil can be; and God extendeth Mercy further then he doth his Justice, Exod. 20. 6. Which vertuous good since we do not derive unto our posteritie, neither do we or shall we partake of our predecessours sinnes, or of any one sinne, except of the onely first sinne of our first predecessour.

7. There was not given either to Adam, or to the sonnes of Adam, any one precept which belonged to all mankinde: I mean such a precept by the breach of which we might have fallen in their fall, or in Adams fall, without our own actuall consent, save onely *one*, of which I spake so much before; neither do the acts of any fathers necessarily binde all his descendents. Jonadab the sonne of Rechab commanded his children, saying, *Ye shall drink no wine, neither ye nor your sonnes for ever: neither shall ye build house, nor sow seed, nor plant vineyard, nor have any*, Jerem. 35. 6, 7. They are commended because they *performed the commandment of their father*, vers. 16. and are blessed for obeying and keeping all his precepts, vers. 18. but therefore (in my opinion) more commended and more blessed, because the performance was more of voluntary devotion, then of binding necessitie, or a meer imperious charge: for his precepts could not lay so great a tie upon all his descendents: but certainly the obedience was of free condescent, not coactive command; unlesse we say, by immediate divine revelation he was commanded to put that yoke upon his posteritie for ever.

It is a true maxime in School-divinitie, [a] *Meerly personals are not transmitted.* Of this sort is holinesse and sinne; and therefore not traducted unto others. After Zacharie was dumbe, Luk. 1. 24. he begat John Baptist, *a crier, the voice of one crying*, Mark 1. 3. And John 9. 20. the blinde man had parents which could see. Halting Jacob, Genes. 32. 32. begat the lion Judah: the lusty-lovely Jonathan, the lame Mephibosheth. But there are others which may be called *mixt-personals*, and these are oftentimes hereditarily derived. Thus through the noisome qualitie of the seed, one leper begetteth an other; and a father subject to the stone or gout, transmitteth those diseases full often to his children: and it hath been the wish of some Physicians, and (if I be not much mistaken) I have read it as the practise of some countries or commonwealths, that they that are naturally subject to contagious diseases, or evils hereditary, as Apoplexies, Epilepsies, Consumptions, or the like, are forbidden to sow their seed in wholsome ground; yea, are forbidden marriage, to avoid future danger. But these diseases reach not to infect the soul with sinne. Aquinas on Rom. 5. Lect. 3. goeth one step further: *The sonnes are like the fathers, even in the defects of the soul; Angry and mad men are begotten of angry and*

[a] *Purè personalia non propagantur.*

mad men. Yet in the end he cloſeth thus, *It is manifeſt, that though the firſt ſinne of the firſt Adam be traducted to poſterity by the originall; yet Adams other ſinnes, or the ſinnes of other men are not derived to their children: becauſe by the onely firſt ſinne* ſublatum eſt bonum naturæ, *that naturall good was taken away, which ſhould have been traducted* per originem naturæ, *by the originall of nature. By other ſinnes the good of perſonall grace is withdrawn, which paſſeth not over to poſteritie. Hence it is, that though Adams ſinne was blotted out by his repentance, yet his repentance could not wipe out the ſinne of his poſteritie: becauſe his repentance was by an act perſonall, which could not extend it ſelf beyond his perſon.* So farre Aquinas. But let diſcourſe give way to Scripture. Jer. 31.29,30. *They ſhall ſay no more, The fathers have eaten a ſowre grape, and the childrens teeth are ſet on edge: but every one ſhall die for his own iniquitie; every man that eateth the ſowre grape, his teeth ſhall be ſet on edge.* They had occaſion to uſe this proverb, in reference to Adam who ate one ſowre grape, in whom we ſinned and are puniſhed. But *as I live, ſaith the Lord God, ye ſhall not have occaſion any more to uſe this proverb in Iſrael,* Ezek.18.3. *Behold, all ſouls are mine; as the ſoul of the father, ſo alſo the ſoul of the ſonne is mine: the ſoul that ſinneth, it ſhall die,* verſ. 4. And when God ſaid, Exod.20.5. *I viſit the ſinnes of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me:* I anſwer, Firſt, the place ſpeaketh not of the ſinnes of children, (for the fathers perſonall iniquitie maketh not the ſonne inique or wicked) it is onely ſpoken of puniſhments. Secondly, even puniſhment eternall doth not reach from the father to the ſonne, unleſſe the ſonne communicate with the ſinne of the father: for *if a wicked father beget a ſonne that ſeeth all his fathers ſinnes, which he hath done, and conſidereth, and doth not ſuch like, he ſhall not die for the iniquitie of his father, he ſhall ſurely live,* Ezek. 18. 14, 17. In this ſort you may object, A man ſhall not be puniſhed at all for the ſinnes of his forefathers, but for his own ſinnes onely. I anſwer, He may be puniſhed temporally, but not eternally: for in temporall chaſtiſements, as there be many cauſes producing one effect, ſo many ſinnes, even of diverſe men, may be corrected by one puniſhment; and the father is often more grievouſly puniſhed in his ſonne, then in himſelf.

Now having ſpoken what I thought convenient, concerning the propagation of originall corruption unto all the poſteritie of Adam, I am in the laſt place to ſhew the juſt conſequent, That as he did die for that his ſinne, ſo we his offspring for having that ſinne ſhould die; and in regard of this ſinne, *It is appointed for men to die,* and to undergo that puniſhment. For original ſinne is in one regard a fault of tranſgreſſion, and the ſame originall ſinne, in a different reſpect is alſo a puniſhment. [b] *As*

[b] Aug. de baptiſmo parvulorum.

every

every man was in Adam, and his corrupted nature was propagated to us, it is a ſinne: as originall ſinne is conſiderable in every man, without reflecting on the common nature, it is a puniſhment. It is ſo a ſinne, or ſuch a ſinne, that it is alſo a puniſhment: and we have ſpoken of it as a ſinne, let us now deſcend to handle it as it is a puniſhment.

MOſt Prepotent, Eternall, and onely Wiſe God, I a poore dejected ſinner, with an humble and contrite ſoul, devoutly beg pardon at thy Mercie-ſeat, confeſsing from the bottome of my heart, my manifold, perſonall, and actuall ſinnes, from all which if thy Grace had prevented me, yet my offence in Adam and with him had juſtly condemned me: But I meekly beſeech thy Divine Majeſtie, that I may be one of thoſe many, to whom the bloud of thy deare Sonne ſhall do more good, then the fault of Adam did hurt. Grant this, I beſeech Thee, for the Al-ſufficient merit of thy onely Sonne, our onely deare and gracious redeemer, Jeſus Chriſt. Amen.

CHAP. VII.

1. A review of the laſt point. Zanchius not againſt it. Bucer and Martyr are but faint, and rather negative then poſitive.

2. Bucer and Martyr make the ſtate of the queſtion to be voluble, not fixt and ſetled. Their objections anſwered. The place of Exodus 20.5. examined.

3. S. Auguſtine appealed unto, and defended.

4. God juſtly may, and doth puniſh with any temporall puniſhment, any children like or unlike unto their parents, for their parents perſonall ſinnes.

5. God doth, and may juſtly puniſh ſome children eternally, and all temporally for originall ſinne, whether they be like their parents in actuall averſion, yea or no.

6. God juſtly puniſheth, even eternally, wicked children, if they reſemble wicked parents.

7. God oftentimes puniſheth one ſinne with an other.

8. The perſonall holineſſe of the parent, never conveyed grace or ſalvation to the ſonne.

9. God never puniſhed eternally the reall iniquities of the fathers upon their children, if the children were holy.

10. No perſonall ſinnes can be communicated. The point handled at large againſt the errour of Bucer and Martyr.

11. The arguments or authorities for my opinion. The new Writers not to be overvalued. Zanchius himſelf is againſt Bucer and Martyr.

1. HAving thus farre proceeded, and (as I thought) without the contradiction of any, I found by the diſcourſe of a loving learned friend, that diverſe late Writers were otherwiſe minded in the point laſt handled in the former chapter; whereupon I betook my ſelf to review it. Zanchius *in locis commun. Theolog.* upon the ſecond chapter of the Epheſ. *loc. prim.* toward the end, bringeth this objection againſt one part of his definition of originall ſinne: *Some ſay, that if therefore Adams ſinne was transferred to poſteritie, becauſe we were*

in

in his loyns; by the ſame reaſon, the other ſinnes of Adam and our other parents ſhould be likewiſe traducted: which is abſurd, and cometh not alwayes to paſſe; ſince of evil parents oftentimes the beſt children are born. He anſwereth, firſt, *The reaſon is not alike: for the firſt ſinne was not ſo proper and perſonall to Adam, as common to humane nature: his other ſinnes, and others after him are truely perſonall.* Which anſwer is excellent, and he confirmeth it at large. Then cometh he to a ſecond anſwer, which is not his own, but onely barely related, without his approving or open diſproving of it. [a] *Beſides, many learned men denie, that it is abſurd to ſay, that the ſinnes of the next parents are communicated to the children; ſo that ſonnes are born like their parents, vicious and perverſe ſonnes of vicious and perverſe parents; which they confirm by experience, by examples of Scripture, by Exod.20.5. And Auguſtine truely in Enchirid. cap. 46. ſaith it is probable for that place of Exodus. For, ſaith he, if the ſonne ſhall not beare the iniquitie of the father, but the ſoul that ſinneth ſhall die, and yet God viſit the ſinnes of the fathers upon the children; it ſeemeth to follow, that the ſinnes of the parents paſſe over to the ſonnes, and the ſonnes follow the ſinnes of the parents, that thoſe ſinnes may be juſtly puniſhed in them, which are not ſo proper to the parents, as common both to parents and children.* And for this opinion he citeth Bucer and Martyr. All this cloud (for it is but a cloud, and an empty one alſo) will quickly be diſperſed. Firſt, in the generall replication obſerve, that Zanchius himſelf never ſpecializeth this, as his own judgement. Secondly, note how cautelouſly Bucer and Martyr carry it on the negative; *Many learned men denie that it is abſurd to ſay, &c.* Themſelves ſee no convincing demonſtration, but are content if their opinion be not *abſurd*. Errours there are that are abſurd; if this be not abſurd, all is well. Thirdly, of thoſe *many* are but two named by him, Bucer and Martyr: learned men indeed, yet not more learned then many that herein differed from them. Fourthly, many words are *homonymous*, and they themſelves ſlide back from them, by varying the ſtate of the queſtion, as will appeare by and by. Laſtly, let the grounds by me ſet down in the laſt chapter be well weighed, and the truth will appeare on my ſide.

[a] *Deinde, negant multi viri docti abſurdum eſſe, ſi dicatur, peccata proximorum parentum communicari liberis; ità ut ſimiles parentibus naſcantur filii, vitioſi vitioſis.*

2. Now let me deſcend to the matter of their objections. [b] *The ſinnes of the next parents are communicated to the children,* ſay they. Here they ſhould have been punctuall, and I deſire to be ſatisfied what they mean; Whether the ſinnes of the father and mother be transfuſed into all the ſonnes and daughters: and into all of them alike, or not alike? And if the father be vertuous, and the mother wicked; or contrariwiſe, the mother vertuous and the father wicked, what is communicated to the childe? Secondly, what ſinnes be communicated? all, or ſome? Whether Atheiſme and profaneneſſe of thoughts, or

[b] *Peccata proximorum parentum communicantur liberis.*

onely ſuch ſinnes as the bodie is much imployed in performance of? Thirdly, whether the ſinnes of grand-fathers and grand-mothers be derived? and if ſo, whether if there be a good grand-father and a good grand-mother and a good father, the children ſhall inherit no goodneſſe, but the ſinne of their wicked mother onely? Or if two of them be good, and two bad; the males good, and the females bad; or contrariwiſe; what ſinne ſhall be communicated to their children? Fourthly, whether the ſinnes of the great-grand-father, and of his parents, our more remote progenitours, be derived? and where beginneth the derivation of theſe ſinnes? and why from ſuch determinate perſons and generations, rather then from others? Or whether they muſt reach up from all the deſcendants of Adam, to his actuall and perſonall ſinnes? Fifthly, whether ſuch actuall and perſonall ſinnes as are repented of by our parents and all our forefathers, be derived unto us? or onely ſuch as they were not repentant of? or both ſorts of them? Sixthly, let noveltie know, *Peccata proximorum communicantur liberis*, in ſtead of *Propagantur ad liberos*, is an unknown phraſe to antiquitie: and it is better to ſpeak plainly according to the dayes of the Fathers, then in terms covert and dubious; and then in defence of ſuch riddles, to ſay no more then the old Tenet, [c] *Deceit lieth hidden in univerſals.*

The ſecond branch of pendulous new-fangledneſſe is this: [d] *The ſinnes of the next parents are communicated to the children; ſo that children are born like unto their parents, vicious of vicious.* Firſt, it is *petitio principii*, that the vicious childe being like to his vicious father, proceedeth from the fathers multiplied tranſgreſſions: for if he be like to his father in ſinne, he is alſo, in that regard, as like and more like to many other actuall ſinners, from whom there could proceed no generative communication of iniquitie. Secondly, what is naturall, is ordinary, is oftneſt, is alwayes ſo, without ſome notable hinderance: but the childrens being like the parents are not thus; therefore the communication is not naturall. Thirdly, ſuppoſe a wicked ſonne curſeth his father, or wiſheth him dead, or mocks at him; he alſo begetteth a ſonne, which ſonne doth the like to him, as he did to his father: ſhall we ſay (if the generation had deſcended, after many, from Cham, who laught or mockt at his father, Gen. 9. 22.) that this ſinne of Cham was traduced, derived, or did paſſe over to this laſt mocker? or ſhall we ſay it was derived unto him from the perſonall ſinne of his immediate laſt father? No; we muſt rather ſay, it was derived unto him from his laſt parents, in and by that originall ſinne onely, which was traduced. That this may the better be manifeſted, conſider theſe points. Firſt, that Adams firſt ſinne, though it were one onely, yet more ſinnes were involved in it. Auguſtine

ſaith

[c] *In univerſalibus latet dolus.*

[d] *Peccata proximorum parentum communicantur liberis; ità ut ſimiles parentibus naſcantur liberi, vitioſi vitioſis.*

saith, [e] *In that one sinne, which by one man entred into the world, and passed over to all men, more sinnes may be understood, if that one sinne be divided into all its parts or members.* And he found there many branches of Adams sinne, and denieth not but more may be found *in hoc uno admisso, in that one committed.* Secondly, he maketh that one to be transfused unto all mankinde. Thirdly, none in the world were ever more eager then some of these latter times, to aggravate the greatnesse of original sinne. Illyricus is almost frantick on the point. Zanchius and others are truely peremptory, that all faculties of body and soul are infected. Let me adde, There never was sinne, nor can be, but the seed of it was couched in the sinne originall. So that every man hath just cause to blesse God, for withholding him from every sinne, great or small; since every man hath a naturall inclination to every sinne, even unto that sinne which (by Gods grace) he most detesteth. Therefore if wicked children be like their parents, it proceedeth not from their parents personall transgressions, but from that one infectious root of the first sinne of Adam, strengthened by connivence, ill breeding, or custome, or ill company. Fourthly, an holy man and woman who never mocked their parents, have a sonne who mocks at them; shall his mocking proceed from his parents, or his parents parents, who never personally did the like? or shall Chams sinne be communicated to him? Then, why do they instance in this sinne of the next parents? If they mean, it is communicated in originall sinne, they mean what I say, and contrary to their own words. Lastly, sinne originall is alike in all and every one, and alike remitted in Baptisme of infants; yea, though the parents should be infidels, and send their childe for fashion-sake, or by way of jesting to be baptized: if the Church know not so much, and if the childe be offered unto God by the wel-meaning devotion and faith of Priest and people present, and be baptized with true matter and form, it receiveth spirituall regeneration, as I read long since, if my memory fail me not, in S. Augustine. The personall offences or holinesse of parents are not communicated to their children. Again, they object, that they confirm this by experience. These are words of winde, and nothing else. That wicked ones beget often children like to them, who denieth? That their children have their fathers personall sinnes transmitted, is the begging of the question. Yea, but they prove it by examples of Scripture. How? or where? By the place, Exod. 20. 5. *I visit the sinnes of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me.* I answer, He doth not say, *I transmit*, or *communicate sinnes*, which is our onely question. Even Illyricus himself among all his expositions of *visitare*, hath none for *communicare, propagare, transfundere, transferre:*

[e] *In illo uno peccato, quod per unum hominem intravit in mundum, & in omnes homines pertransiit, —possunt intelligi plura peccata, si unum ipsum in sua quasi membra dividatur singula.* Aug. Enchir. cap. 43.

ferre: and particulary of this place of Exodus, he ſaith, [f] *Viſiting the iniquitie of the fathers, that is, puniſhing the poſteritie for the enormious ſinnes of their anceſtours.* Yet if *to viſit* had been *to propagate actuall ſinnes*, it had been his beſt proof, That the ſubſtance of the ſoul is corrupt by originall ſinne, and hath in it the image of Satan. They alledge S. Auguſt. who ſaith it is probable by that place of Exodus. The words of S. Auguſt. are theſe in the place by them cited, [g] *It is not improbably ſaid, that children are liable to the ſinnes of their parents, not onely of their firſt parents, but alſo thoſe of whom they are immediately born.* And at the end of that chapter, [h] *In that one ſinne, which paſſed over to all men, and is ſo great, that in it humane nature was changed and turned to a neceſſitie of death, more ſinnes are found; and other of parents, which albeit they change not our nature, yet by their guilt they binde children:* where he makes an apparent diſtinction, between that one ſinne which changed our nature and was propagated unto us, and thoſe other perſonall ſinnes of our fathers, which change not our nature, but binde us over unto puniſhment: for that is his meaning of *reatu obligant.* He doth no where ſay, ſuch ſinnes are communicated unto us, or that they binde us with the guilt of offence; but he is to be underſtood of the guilt of puniſhment. And ſo Bellarmine expounds him, *De amiſſion. grat. & ſtatu peccati* 4.18. Indeed he doth it ſomewhat timerouſly towards the beginning of the chapter with a [i] *perchance.* But he is more poſitive and fully aſſertive at the latter end of the ſame chapter, that Auguſtine and the Fathers ſpake onely of the communication of puniſhment, which Bellarmine proveth, becauſe they inſtance in Exod.20.5. which hath apparent reference to puniſhment: and indeed ſo the word *viſit* is moſt-wiſe uſed in Scripture, *viz.* for to *puniſh:* and ſometimes in love, mercy, grace, and goodneſſe, to *viſit:* but never is uſed for the communicating, or propagating, trajecting, or tranſmitting of ſinnes. Nay, [k] Gregorie goeth further, as he is cited by Bellarmine, teaching that the place of Exodus is to be underſtood of thoſe children, who imitate the ſinnes of their parents: and *ſo the Chaldee Paraphraſe hath it,* ſaith Vatablus. Laſtly, to cleare this truth, that Auguſtine in that place meant onely the binding over unto puniſhment, ſee his own words, Chap. 47. (which I marvel that Bellarmine paſſeth over) [l] *But touching the ſinnes of other parents, by which every one from Adam himſelf to his own father ſucceeds his anceſtours, it may well be diſputed, Whether he that is born be involved in the evil acts and multiplied original ſinnes of all; ſo that how much the later any man is born, ſo much the worſe: Or whether God doth therefore threaten the poſterity unto the third and fourth generation for their parents ſinnes, becauſe, through his mercifull moderation, he extends his wrath no further for the faults of progenitours;*

[f] *Viſitans iniquitatem patrum, id eſt, puniens poſteros ob majorum ſuorum enormia delicta.*

[g] *Parentum quoq; peccatis parvulos obligari, non ſolùm primorum hominum, ſed etiam ſuorum de quibus ipſi nati ſunt, non improbabiliter dicitur.*

[h] *In illo uno, quod in omnes homines pertranſiit, atq; tam magnum eſt, ut in eo mutaretur & converteretur in neceſſitatem mortis humana natura, reperiuntur plura peccata; & alia parentum, quæ etſi non poſſunt mutare naturam, reatu tamen obligant filios.*

[i] *Fortaſſe, non de contagione culpæ, ſed de communicatione pœnæ locuti ſunt Auguſtinus* —

[k] Greg. Mor. 15.22.

[l] *Sed de peccatis aliorum parentum, quibus ab ipſo Adam uſq; ad patrem ſuum progeneratoribus ſuis quiſque ſuccedit, non immeritò diſceptari poteſt, utrùm omnium malis actibus & multiplicatis delictis originalibus, qui naſcitur implicetur, ut tantò pejùs, quantò poſteriùs quiſque naſcatur: Ac propterea Deus in tertiam & quartam generationem de peccatis eorum poſteris comminetur, quia iram ſuam, quantum ad progenitorum ſuorum culpas, non extendit ulteriùs, moderatione miſerationis ſuæ; nè illi quibus regenerationis gratia non confertur, nimiâ ſarcinâ in ipſa ſua æterna damnatione premerentur, ſi cogerentur ab initio generis humani omnia præcedentium parentum ſuorum originaliter peccata contrahere, & pœnas pro iis debitas pendere. An aliud aliquid, de re tanta, in Scripturis ſanctis diligentiùs perſcrutatis & tractatis, valeat vel non valeat reperiri, temerè non audeo affirmare.*

tours; leſt they to whom the grace of regeneration is not given, ſhould be preſſed with too great a burden in their eternall damnation, if they were forced to contract the original ſinnes of all their forefathers from the beginning of mankinde, and to undergo the puniſhments due to them. Or whether ſome thing elſe concerning ſo weighty a matter may be found in the holy Scriptures diligently ſearched and peruſed, I dare not raſhly affirm. You have the whole chapter word for word out of S. Auguſtine. In which obſerve, Firſt, the adverſative particle *Sed*, diſtinguiſhing the queſtion from the other: which alſo Eraſmus in the margin hath thus diverſified, comprifing the meaning of the 46 chapter in theſe words, [m] *That the children are bound by the ſinnes of their parents:* and of the 47 chapter, [n] *We ought not raſhly to determine how farre the ſinnes of anceſtours be extended.* Secondly, in the former chapter he ſaid exactly, [o] *It is not improbably ſaid, that infants are bound by the ſinnes of their parents.* He changeth the phraſe in the latter, [p] *It may well be diſputed;* and, *I dare not raſhly affirm.* Thirdly, his phraſes in the former chapter are not ſo diſtinct, as in the latter, where he mentioneth both the *contracting* of ſinnes, and *undergoing puniſhment* for them. Fourthly, weigh this ſtrong inconvenience which he toucheth at, That the latter born in time, is ſtill the worſe in nature, worſe then any that went before; as followeth neceſſarily, if the ſinnes of our forefathers are communicated to us. Fifthly, he ſeemeth to conclude the unreaſonableneſſe, That they who were never regenerated, ſhould be overburdened with eternall damnation, if they ſhould be compelled from the beginning of mankinde to contract the ſinnes of all their progenitours, and be puniſhed for them. And therefore he queſtioneth, Whether it reacheth onely to the third and fourth generation. I would alſo queſtion, Whether (if the threat reach onely to the third and fourth generation) upon ſuppoſall, that from Adam all the predeceſſours of a man were wicked till the fourth generation, that man ſhall have none of thoſe ſinnes imputed to him, before his progenitours in a fourth aſcent. Or if an others progenitours were all good from Adam till the foure laſt generations, and from it all and every of his parents, in a lineall deſcent, were ſtarknaught, till we come to himſelf, who is good, Whether he ſhall have communicated to him the ſinnes of theſe foure laſt progenitours, and no goodneſſe for a thouſand generations of holy and repentant forefathers (himſelf alſo being a holy man) ſince God ſheweth mercy unto thouſands that love him, that is, more mercy to more good men, then ſeveritie, which extendeth, even towards his haters, but to the third and fourth generation; which number is ſhort of thouſands.

The laſt objection from the place of Exodus, is this; [q] *It ſeems to follow, that God doth permit that the ſinnes of parents paſſe unto their*

[m] *Peccatis parentum obligari filios.*

[n] *Quouſque majorum peccata provogentur, non temerè definiendum.*

[o] *Non improbabiliter dicitur, parentum peccatis parvulos obligari.*

[p] *Non immeritò diſceptari poteſt; &, Non audeo temerè affirmare.*

[q] *Conſequi videtur, Deum permittere ut peccata parentum in filios tranſeant.*

their children, and the ſonnes imitate the ſinnes of their fathers, that God may juſtly puniſh ſinnes, which are not ſo proper to the parent, as to the parent and childe. I anſwer, He doth well to mince it with *It ſeems to follow*. But, *Quædam videntur, & non ſunt; Some things ſeem to be, and are not*. Bucer and Martyr do float too much in generalities; they neither mention what ſinnes, all, or ſome; neither what parents, good, bad, or all; nor what they mean by *paſſing*, when they ſay, [r] *The ſinnes of parents paſſe unto the children*. There are alſo nets and ginns in theſe their words, [s] *The ſpot and, as it were, contagion of ſinne over-ſpreadeth the fathers body, and by his bloud and ſeed redoundeth upon the children*. Before they ſaid *ſinnes*, now *the ſpot of ſinnes*, though there be a great difference between them two: for the ſinne is paſt before the ſpot cometh, and the latter is the effect of the former. Again, becauſe it is eaſie to prove, that [t] *the ſtain of the father redoundeth not on the children*; it is added, [u] *the ſpot and, as it were, contagion*. Moreover, how unaptly do they bring the place of Exodus, to prove *the ſinnes of the next parents to be communicated* (if by them they underſtand onely the immediate father and mother) when in that place there is expreſſe mention of the third and fourth generation? If they ſtretch the words [*of the next parents*] to the third and fourth generation onely, why not to the fifth, ſixth, and ſo upward? Sixteen generations ſince Chriſts time, are the next parents, if you compare them to the thirty nine generations, which in the law of Nature and of Moſes preceded Chriſt. Laſtly, note their wilde inference, God permits the fathers ſinne to paſſe unto the childe, and the childe to imitate the father *that he may puniſh*: as if God could not juſtly puniſh the ſinnes of the fathers in the children, unleſſe they be like them in perſonall tranſgreſſions: as if the communication of original ſinne onely, were not cauſe enough to puniſh children for the ſinnes of their parents: as if the evil of ſinne were ordained to juſtifie the evil of puniſhment. Away then with this fiſhing in troubled waters, this delighting in amphibolous terms. Which cenſure that I may the rather juſtifie, I will endeavour to explain all things neceſſary to the knowledge of this point, to ſalve all doubts, to unfold all intricacies in theſe ſeven propoſitions.

[r] *Peccata parentum in filios tranſeunt.*

[s] *Peccatorum labes & ceu contagium redundat in patris corpus, & per ejus ſanguinem & ſemen in filios.*

[t] *Macula patris non redundat in filios.*

[u] *Labes & ceu contagium.*

4. God juſtly may, and doth puniſh with any temporall puniſhment, any children *like* or *unlike* to their parents, for their fathers perſonall ſinnes. *Horat. Epod.* 7.

—Immerentis fluxit in terram Remi
Sacer nepotibus cruor.

And *Carminum* 3. *Ode* 6.

Delicta majorum immeritus lues, Romane—

For the children are a part of the fathers, and in the childes puniſhment the father himſelf is puniſhed. For as a ſonne receiveth

veth (under God) life and the things of this life, by the father: ſo it is no injuſtice, if he loſe the ſame for him. The widow of Zarephath her ſonne, was (in her apprehenſion) dead for her ſinne, 1.King.17.18. So, 2.Sam.12.15. God ſtroke the childe that Uriahs wife bare to David, and it was ſick and died. Both father and childe endured a puniſhment of ſeven dayes: the father in ſorrow faſting a faſt, lying on the earth, in a holy ſordiditie weeping and praying: the childe by ſickneſſe tormenting him to death. Ahabs children were puniſhed for his offence, 1. King. 21. 21. and among the reſt Jehoram his ſonne: who although he wrought evil in the ſight of the Lord, yet was not ſo bad as his father or mother, 2. Kings 3. 2. The paſſage is very obſervable, Jer. 16. 3,4. *For thus ſaith the Lord concerning the ſonnes and daughters that are born in this place, and concerning their mothers and fathers, They ſhall die of grievous deaths: Both the great and ſmall ſhall die*, verſ. 6. The puniſhment of Gehazi his poſterity is more exemplarie: for though they ſinned not, nor could ſinne the ſinne of Gehazi; yet the leproſie of Naaman did cleave unto him, for that his perſonall ſimonie, and unto his ſeed for ever, 2.Kings 5. 27. The caſe of Jobs children ſurpaſſeth this: for they were not ſtricken with death for their own ſinnes, or the ſinnes of their father Job, ſo much as for the triall of his patience, and for the experimentall confutation of Satan; yet was it not unjuſt that they ſhould loſe their lives for their fathers good, which they had by him; ſince he alſo ſuffered in their ſufferings, and might eaſily ſee Gods eſpeciall hand againſt himſelf: For the greateſt winde in the world naturally cannot ſmite the foure corners of an houſe; and if it ſhould, yet one corner would uphold the other: but this whirlwinde did ſo, *and the houſe fell*, Job 1.19. 1.Sam.15.6. the Kenites are ſpared, becauſe *they ſhewed kindeneſſe to the children of Iſrael when they came out of Egypt*: but becauſe Amalek had *fought with Iſrael*, Exod. 17.8. though they were preſently puniſhed, by being vanquiſhed in battell; yet God ſaid, verſ. 14. *Write this for a memoriall in a book, — I will utterly put out the remembrance of Amalek under heaven. — And the Lord did ſwear he would have warre with Amalek from generation to generation;* Exod. 7.16. And above foure generations after, about 400 yeares, Saul deſtroyed them. A *Quære* indeed may be made, Whether God can juſtly puniſh the fathers for the childrens actuall delinquencies. And this reſolution is eaſie, That he may do it, if the father hath doted on the children, & not duely corrected them: (for ſo did God to * Eli) or if wicked children do tenderly love their parents (which though it be not uſuall, yet it hath been ſo;) and in this caſe the puniſhment of the father is indeed a puniſhment alſo of the childe. But if an holy father do his duty, and hate his ſonnes courſes, and thereupon the

* 1.Sam.2.29.

the childe loveth not his father; if God can puniſh the father with temporall puniſhments for the notorious faults of his ſonne, yet he will not puniſh him eternally. Nay, I will go yet further, and truely avouch, that the ſinnes of predeceſſours which are not of conſanguinitie with us, but are fathers onely by our imitation, fully may be puniſhed on their children. Firſt, the word *father* is taken two wayes in Scripture: for either there are fathers by imitation, or fathers by nature, from whoſe loyns we lineally deſcend. The Jews, though they came not of Cain (whoſe poſterity ended at the floud) yet may be ſaid to be his *ſonnes* by imitation: yea they are called *the ſonnes of Satan*, Joh.8.44. becauſe they followed his ſteps, and *did the work of their father*, verſ.41. which is one degree more remote. Thoſe, who thus take a pattern for themſelves out of example of wicked anceſtours, God juſtly puniſheth. Satan having been *a murderer from the beginning*, John 8.44. Cain being (as it were) the head of murderers among men, and the Jews treading in their ſteps to an inch, they may juſtly be caſt into the ſame fire *prepared for the devil and his angels*, Matth. 25.41. And the Apoſtle S. Jude juſtly pronounceth, verſ. 11. *Wo to them that have gone in the way of Cain.* Yea, our bleſſed Saviour himſelf foretelleth the Jews, that for their bloudy proceedings, *Upon* them *ſhall come all the righteous bloud ſhed upon the earth, from the bloud of the righteous Abel, unto the bloud of Zacharias, whom* they *ſlew, &c.* Mat.23.35. Where, firſt, the diſtinct deaths of ſeverall martyrs or juſt ones (as the Syriack hath it) is called αἷμα δίκαιον, *one juſt bloud*: ſecondly, they are ſaid to ſlay Zacharias, whom others ſlew: thirdly, the bloud is not ſaid in the preterperfect tenſe, *to have been ſhed*; but in the preſent tenſe, αἷμα ἐκχυνόμενον, *which is ſhed*, or *is now a ſhedding*. as Jeruſalem is called, verſ.37. ἡ ἀποκτείνουσα, *quæ occidiſti, occîdis, occiſura es*, as Eraſmus well expounds it. All theſe circumſtances concurre, to make (as it were) one continued act of murder, from the beginning of the world till the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, repayed with one and the ſame puniſhment upon the father and all the ſonnes of imitation. Now as the puniſhment of the fathers by imitation may in an extended ſenſe be communicated to poſterity: ſo their ſinnes cannot be ſaid to be communicated. For how can the ſinne of Cain be communicated unto him, who laſt of all killed his brother? and unto the Jews, who deſcended not from him, but from the younger brother? Or can we think that God will inflict damnation upon men for others perſonall tranſgreſſions? Temporall chaſtiſements he may juſtly inflict for the ungracious perpetrations of parents. [x] *There is no vengeance taken on thee, Iſrael, wherein there is not an ounce of the iniquitie of the calf*, ſaith Rabbi Moſes Ben Nachman, whom they call *Ramban*, or *Gerundenſis*. See an excel-

[x] *Non eſt tibi, Iſrael, ultio, in qua non ſit uncia de iniquitate vituli.*

excellent place for both points together, Jerem. 32. 18, 19. And eternall torment can he rightly adjudge the ſoules and bodies of men unto for original ſinne: which is our ſecond propoſition.

5. God may, and juſtly doth puniſh ſome children eternally, and all temporally for originall ſinne, whether they be like their parents in actuall averſion and back-ſliding, yea or no. For the moſt righteous ſonnes of Adam endure pain, labour, ſickneſſe, death, which are the orts and effects of the primogeneall offence: and the death both of ſoul and body was inflicted in *Morte moriemini*: and this ſhall hereafter be fully proved.

6. God juſtly inflicteth eternall puniſhment on wicked children, if they reſemble their wicked parents. [y] *The imitating of wicked men, makes a man to be puniſhed not onely for his own ſinnes, but for theirs alſo whom he imitates.* This is a truth ſo apparent, that it needeth no further proof.

[y] *Malorum imitatio facit, ut non ſolùm ſua, ſed etiam eorum quos imitati ſunt, merita ſortiantur.* Auguſt. in priori Enarrat. Pſal. 108.

7. God oftentimes puniſheth one ſinne with an other. And in my opinion, this manner of puniſhing, if it continue all a mans life, is worſe then the torment of hell-fire, which were better to be ſpeedily undergone, then to be deferred with the increaſe of ſinne. Pſal. 69. 27. *Adde puniſhment of iniquitie*, or *Adde iniquitie unto their iniquitie.* Thus *God gave the Gentiles over to a reprobate minde*, Rom. 1. 28. and then ſuch offenders do but *treaſure up wrath againſt the day of wrath*, Rom. 2. 5. But this happeneth not for the foregoing offences of our progenitours, but for our own tranſgreſſions.

8. The perſonall holineſſe of the parent never conveied grace or ſalvation to the ſonne. *Abraham the father of the faithfull* prayed for his ſonne, Gen. 17. 18. *Oh that Iſhmael might live in thy ſight!* yet was he a caſt-away. Temporall bleſſings indeed he had for Abrahams ſake, verſ. 20. Iſaac had an Eſau, David an Abſalom, and often the like.

9. God never puniſhed eternally the reall iniquities of fathers upon their children, if the children were holy. Let an inſtance be given to the contrarie. Indeed it is ſaid, Pſal. 109. 14. *Let the iniquitie of his fathers be remembred with the Lord, and let not the ſinne of his mother be done away.* But he ſpeaketh, firſt, of a very wicked man, equalling (if not exceeding) his parents in ſinne. And the New Teſtament applieth it to Judas, Act. 1. 20. to Judas, the monſter of men. Secondly, the remembrance mentioned, hath reference rather to penalties conſequent, then onely to ſinnes precedent; [z] *It is remembred in regard of the puniſhment, becauſe the children were pricked for the iniquitie of their fathers who ſlew Chriſt*, ſaith Cajetan on the place. And this is not our queſtion. Thirdly, why may there not be *a change of number*, as Vatablus ſtileth it? And though the

[z] *Memoratur quantum ad pœnam, quoniam puncti ſunt filii pro iniquitate patrum, qui occiderunt Chriſtum.*

Interlinearie bible readeth it *patrum eorum*, and Vatablus ſo expounds it, but reads it *patrum ejus:* why may it not be expounded *patris ejus?* being accordant to that following, *peccatum matris ejus?* and whether it be *patrum eorum*, or *patrum ejus*, or *patris ejus*, I ſee not but originall ſinne may be meant in both places, as being expreſſed onely in the ſingular, rather then the many actuall tranſgreſſions: eſpecially, ſince our ſingular originall ſinne came to him by many fathers: and it was not the intent of Gods Spirit in this Pſalme, to extenuate the ſinnes of the wicked one's forefathers, and to plaiſter this over with the title of one ſingle iniquitie. Indeed Theodoret on the place ſaith thus, [a] *The fathers vertue hath often profited the tranſgreſſing children; as Abrahams faith did the Jews, and Davids pietie Solomon.* So Ceſar at his pardoning of thoſe in Marſeil, and in Athens, who took part with Pompey in the civill warres, ſaid, *They were excuſed for their anceſtours ſake:* as contrarily, [b] *The wickedneſſe of parents increaſeth the puniſhment of like children,* ſaith Theodoret. I anſwer, That all this ſpeaketh of temporal chaſtiſements, none of eternall horrour, infligible upon good children for the ſinnes of their parents. When God ſaith, *I will viſit the ſinnes of the parents*; if it implyed the viſiting them with like ſinnes, as it doth not; yet it is of them that hated him alſo, and by their perſonall hating him deſerved to have one ſinne puniſhed with an other: for the hatred of the ſonnes is meant, as annexed to the ſinnes of the fathers. This any one may ſee that will read Ezekiel 18. 14. *Lo, if a wicked man beget a ſonne that doth not like his father: he ſhall not die for the iniquitie of his father; he ſhall ſurely live*, verſ. 17. *God hath no pleaſure that the wicked ſhould die*, verſ. 23. And hath he delight that the righteous ſhall periſh eternally for his wicked anceſtours? The drift of the whole chapter is againſt it, and proveth his wayes to be equall: becauſe a wicked man repenting ſhall not die for his own tranſgreſſions, verſ. 25. &c. And ſhall a righteous man die, or be condemned (for he meaneth the death of the ſoul) for the offences of others? *Who ever periſhed being innocent? Even as I have ſeen, they that plow iniquitie, and ſow wickedneſſe, reap the ſame*, Job 4. 7, 8. and *God rewardeth every man according*, not to the works of his forefathers, but according *to his* own *works*, Rom. 2. 6. Mat. 16. 27. which ſeemeth to be taken from the Pſalmograph, who aſcribeth to the Lord, not injuſtice, not ſeveritie, but grace and mercie in his judicature; *Unto thee, O Lord, belongeth mercy: for thou rewardeſt every man according to his work*, Pſal. 62. 12. And *Every one ſhall give account of himſelf*, Rom. 14. 12. *Every one ſhall receive the things done in his bodie, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or evil*, 2. Cor. 5. 10. If this be not enough, more may be added with an eaſie hand, to the ſtrengthening of this ſixth Propoſition,

[a] *Paterna virtus ſæpe filiis peccantibus profuit, ut fides Abrahæ Judæis, & Davidis pietas Solomoni.*

[b] *Pravitas patrum filiis ſimilibus pœnam eduiget.*

now

now chiefly queſtioned, *God never damned a good childe for the fathers perſonall wickedneſſe.* I now come to the ſeventh Propoſition.

10. *No perſonall ſinnes can be communicated.* Indeed, they who maintain the traduction of ſouls may, if that be granted, better defend the propagation of actuall iniquities. But that opinion being falſe, ridiculous, exploded, and hereticall, (of which otherwhere in this Tractate) the ſuperſtructive is founded on ſlippery ice: and theſe terms, *To propagate, communicate, derive, tranſmit,* and *tranſſuſe ſinnes perſonall,* are meerly amphibologicall and dubious phraſes. If they mean as the words do ſignifie, let them ſay, that the matter of ſinne actuall is tranſfuſed, or the form, or both. The matter is the action, the form is the obliquitie thereof: both theſe do vaniſh. Doth the guilt of puniſhment paſſe over? [c] *Guilt is a band joyning puniſhment & ſin as a thing coming between them:* And this band is rather in God, then in man, to tie or untie at his pleaſure. [d] *An act that is paſt already, is ſaid to remain in regard of the guilt; not that the guilt is any thing, but becauſe a man is denominated guiltie from ſuch an act. The guilt of ſinne is not any thing, ſince it is neither a ſubſtance nor an accident, but onely remains in the ſecret laws of God and mindes of Angels,* as Holcot, *De Imputab. pec.* truely gathereth from S. Auguſtine. The guilt is not the perſonall ſinne it ſelf, but the effect thereof; and our queſtion is not now of the deſcent of puniſhments. Doth the guilt of ſinne take hold of the childe? they cannot ſay ſo, unleſſe here alſo they confound the effect with the cauſe: and this is but *Petitio principii* in other terms. Again, how heterodoxall is it, to ſay, *A man begetteth a ſonne guiltie of all his actuall iniquities?* For then, though the father may be ſaved by his after-repentance, yet the ſonne who knoweth not perchance, nor ever heard inckling of his fathers horrid and ſecret ſinnes, (according to their poſition) may be damned for them. Do they mean, the ſtain and ſpot is communicated? I anſwer, The ſtain and ſpot is not the actuall ſinne, but the fruit of it inherent in the ſoul of the offender, and not tranſmiſſible by the bodie, and is onely metaphorically termed the ſtain, having no poſitive realitie tranſmiſſible. Zanchius himſelf relates their opinion thus, [e] *That the ſpot and, as it were, contagion of the ſinnes which any parent committeth, doth redound, by Gods juſt judgement, upon his bodie and bloud, and is further transfuſed by his bloud and ſeed into the ſonnes whom he begets of that ſeed thus viciouſly affected.* I anſwer, That [*juſto Dei judicio*] is brought in *tanquam Deus aliquis è machina,* to make things vaſt & improbable ſeem likely & paſſable: but the vain impertinencie of theſe words is eaſily obſervable by any, who knoweth that no manner of Gods judgements are any way unjuſt. Secondly, are not ſinnes of omiſſion perſonall ſinnes? and are they communicated to

[c] *Reatus eſt vinculum inter pœnam & peccatum, quaſi medium interjectum.*

[d] *Actus qui jam tranſiit, dicitur manere quoad reatum; non quia reatus ſit aliquid, ſed quia à tali actu denominatur quis reus. Reatus peccati non eſt aliqua res, cùm non ſit ſubſtantia vel accidens, ſed ſolùm maneat in occultis legibus Dei & mentibus Angelorum.*

[e] *Peccatorum, quæ aliquis parens committit, labem, & ceu contagium juſto Dei judicio redundare in ejus corpus & ſanguinem, & per ejus porrò ſanguinem & ſemen in filios, quos ex illo ſemine ità vitiosè affecto gignit, transfundi.*

the bodie? Thirdly, what ſay you to pride of heart, and ſecret Atheiſme? Is the proud mans, and Atheiſts bodie and bloud infected with theſe prodigies? Again, If ſuch people be wholly forgiven, and their ſinnes by repentance blotted out; are they now in their bodie, ſeed, and bloud, which are wiped out of their ſoul? and ſuppoſe he beget a ſonne between the Atheiſme and repentance; ſhall his childe be damned, while the repentant Atheiſt is ſaved? ſhould not he rather communicate his later repentance, then his former Atheiſme?

But let us weigh the words a little nearer, [f] *The blot and, as it were, contagion of ſinnes which the father commits, redounds upon his bodie and bloud, and by his bloud and ſeed to the ſonnes.* What bloud is corrupted? all, or onely that which was made ſeed? and of ſeed, what ſeed? all ſeed, or onely that which is fruitfull? Suppoſe a father begets a ſonne with the ſeed which was in his bodie yer his ſinne was committed; how doth his ſinne viciate his bloud, or his bloud the preformed ſeed? If ſeed and bloud be properly vicious; then any ejaculation of ſeed, or letting of bloud, ſhould emptie people of their ſinnes or ſtains in them inherent; and ſinne ſhould no longer be a privation, but a poſitive thing. Moreover, when they ſay, *That by the fathers bloud and ſeed, the blot and, as it were, contagion is transfuſed into the ſonnes*, they ſpeak without reaſon or ſenſe. For the blot and, as it were, contagion are transfuſed (if transfuſed at all) into the wombe of their mother, which hath a preexiſtence; and not into the children themſelves, who have no preexiſtence. The veſſell is before any thing can be poured into it; how then can ſinne be yoted by the fathers bloud & ſeed into the childe that had no being? The laſt paſſage is this, *The childrens bodies are firſt infected by theſe ſtains or actuall ſinnes, & their ſouls after defiled by their bodies.* If by the word *infected* they mean, really, truly, properly, and actually infected, I remit them to the place where I have proved, that the Embryo without a reaſonable ſoul is not, cannot be ſinfull: If they would be expounded of a pronitude to evil, or inclinations tending that way, when the ſoul is united; they have made much ado about nothing: a meer logomachy, retaining the old ſenſe, and uſing noveltie of terms. Again, if I ſhould yeeld, That the ſeed of one man is proner to one vice then an other, according to the vivid ſtrength and able diſpoſition of the parents, as (they ſay) baſtards are more healthie, and more ſalacious then other people, as retaining part of that ſpiritfull vigour in which they were begotten; yet is originall ſinne the ſame in every one, alike in all parts and every way; and the likeneſſe to the parents in wickednes is moſt remotely aſcribed to the ſeed, but properly to originall ſinne, as to the inward cauſe; and to the parents ill breeding them, or to bad companie, or cuſtome, or to the remembrance

[f] *Peccatorum, que aliquis parens committit, labes, & ceu contagium, redundat in ejus corpus & ſanguinem, & per ejus ſanguinem & ſemen in filios.*

brance of their parents ſinne (which is a powerfull preſident in corrupt nature) as to the outward cauſe. For a wicked childe is as like a thouſand other wicked men, if not more like in behaviour then to his father; yet this proceedeth not from their ſeed, but from originall ſinne. But to the more diſtinct handling of this point (this ſeventh and laſt Propoſition) Firſt, I will prove, That the perſonall ſinnes of all our forefathers, are not derived to us. Secondly, That not the ſinnes from the third and fourth generation are propagated. Thirdly, That the perſonall ſinnes of our immediate parents are not transfuſed; And ſo it will ariſe of it ſelf, that no perſonall ſinnes are communicated. In the ſecond place I ſhall bring to light the authorities on our ſide. But before I begin either, let me briefly remove an objection. Bucer and Martyr teach (ſaith Zanchius) that by this doctrine the transfuſion of originall ſinne is more confirmed. I anſwer, That Gods truth hath no need of mans lie to uphold it. Cicero ſaid well, g *Perſpicuitie is leſſened by argumentation:* For what is more beleeved, more known to Chriſtians, then that originall ſinne is traduced? Weak arguments do often prejudice a good cauſe; and while Bucer and Martyr would ſeem to confirm that truth, which neither Jew, Turk, nor Chriſtian doubt of, let them take heed, leſt when they ſay actuall ſinnes are traduced, they give occaſion to the world to think, that humane ſouls are not created, but traducted; & ſo by conſequent, bring in the mortalitie of the ſoul. For it hath been confidently averred by learned men, That if the ſouls be traducted, they are mortall. But of this hereafter.

g *Perſpicuitas argumentatione elevatur.*

Concerning the firſt branch, theſe arguments confirm it. If the actuall ſinnes of all our forefathers be communicated to their poſteritie; then they that are the more ancient are ſtill the better; and the laſt people of this world ſhall abſolutely, by nature, be worſt. But it is not ſo: for Pagans and Infidels now ſhould be many thouſand times worſe then the firſt infidels: which is not ſo, as is ſeen by experience. Secondly, then we might truely ſay, *O happy Cain!* happier by nature then Abel the righteous: (ſince Adam and Eve did manifoldly ſinne between Cains and Abels generations) yea, happier then Abraham, and the Patriarchs, juſt Job, and the Prophets, the Apoſtles, and Evangeliſts: ſince thou haſt fewer ſinnes to anſwer for then any in the world. Happier is all the drowned world in this regard, then the dayes ſince Chriſt. But to ſay ſo, is new Divinity. Therefore all ſinnes of actually tranſgreſſing parents are not communicated. Secondly, God dealeth not ſo rigourouſly with mankinde, as he did with the devils: *Verily he took not on him the nature of Angels, but took on him the ſeed of Abraham,* Heb. 2. 16. whereby he magnifieth Gods mercy to man, above that to the rebellious ſpirits: but he ſhould or did deal

worſe with mankinde, at leaſt with the damned, then with them, if all the perſonall ſinnes of our progenitours be communicated to all us. For each of them bare onely but their own ſinnes, and none did beare one anothers ſinne further then they actually partaked with it. And this can not be otherwiſe: for both their ſinne was pride, and their nature uncapable of propagation, or communication of ſinne, unleſſe it be by reall and preſent conſenting or partaking. Laſtly, *They all fell together the ſecond or third inſtant of their creation*, ſaith the School. Suddenly the devil of *Lucifer* became *Coluber*; of *Oriens, Occidens*; of *Heſperus, Veſper*. *He abode not in the truth*, Joh.8.44. *Satan fell from heaven like lightning*: where lightning is not ſaid to fall from heaven; but he *ſaw* Σατανᾶν, ὡς ἀστραπὴν, ὀπὸ τῦ ἰρανῦ πεσόντα. not πεσόν, Luk. 10.18. *Satan falling as ſuddenly from heaven, as lightning doth* from the clouds on us; which is gone ere we can ſay it is come. Yea, not Satan alone, but the reſt of the Angels *kept not their firſt eſtate*, Jude verſ.6. which Job thus varieth, *God found no ſtedfaſtneſſe in his Angels*, Job 4.18. Seneca might well ſay of materials, Epiſt. 91. *No great thing but had ſome ſpace of time in its ruine and deſtruction*; yet in ſpirituals he was blinde or miſtaken. For there was no ſucceſſion of times in the ſinnes of any ſinning Angels: but as at once they were puniſhed, and their place found no more in heaven; ſo at once almoſt they ſinned: nor did ſucceeding Angels beare their predeceſſours ſinnes or puniſhments: Therefore mankinde ſhall not do ſo neither.

[h] *Nulla res magna non aliquod habuit ruinæ ſuæ ſpatium.*

Thirdly, S. Auguſtine in his Enchiridion, chap. 47. toucheth at this argument as unreaſonable, if they who have not the grace of regeneration, ſhould contract the ſinnes and beare the puniſhment of all their progenitours, from the beginning of the world; ſaying, [i] *They ſhould be overburdened in their eternall damnation.* But God puniſheth rather *citra*, then *ultra condignum*; *rather leſſe, then more then we deſerve*; and his mercie is above all his works. And as his wrath is to three or foure deſcents, ſo his mercie extendeth unto more, unto thouſands; but his mercie is not ſhewed unto more, if all our forefathers ſinnes lie upon us, unleſſe we can finde that there is ſomewhat more then *all*. Therefore mankinde contracteth not the ſinnes, nor ſuffereth the eternall puniſhments due to the ſinnes of all our parents.

[i] *Premerentur nimiâ ſarcinâ in æterna ſua damnatione.*

Fourthly, The juſtice of God will not permit the ſame ſinne a million of times among many millions of perſons to be puniſhed: but thus it muſt be, if Seth anſwer for Adam and Eves actuall ſinnes, and all Seths poſteritie to this day for every one of their predeceſſours ſinnes. Therefore *all ſinnes of progenitours are not communicated.*

This firſt branch receiveth ſtrength and confirmation from the

the ſecond, which is this, *Perſonall ſinnes of our progenitours are not derived or communicated unto us from the third or fourth generation, much leſſe do they reach up to our firſt parents.* Indeed the great S. Auguſtine in his Ench. chap. 47. makes this *Quære, Whether God threaten poſteritie with the ſinnes of their fathers, from the third and fourth generation; or threaten the fathers with puniſhing their poſteritie, becauſe his wrath extendeth no further, leſt poſteritie ſhould be overburdened: Or whether ſome other thing concerning this buſineſſe, may, or may not be found by diligent ſearch of Scriptures, I dare not raſhly affirm.* But I hope, without raſhneſſe, I may be bold to affirm, that God threatneth not to puniſh ſinne with ſinne in that place, but with other puniſhment. Secondly, nor menaceth eternall puniſhments for the onely ſinnes of parents preceding: but onely the commination is of temporall puniſhments, if they be unlike their wicked parents; & eternall, if they be like in ſinne unto them. This being the apparent meaning of the place, and the word *viſito* being ever taken to be ſynonymous with *punio*, or *caſtigo*, whenſoever it is contraoppoſed to *facere miſericordiam* (as here it is) whereupon Gods judgement is called *the viſitation of ſouls*, Wiſd. 3. 13. Pſal. 89. 32. *I will viſit their tranſgreſſion with the rod, and their iniquitie with ſtripes*, or *ſcourges*. Let me in the third place affirm, That though God puniſh poſteritie temporally, for the onely ſinnes of parents; and eternally, if wicked children reſemble their parents; yet it followeth not, that ſinnes are communicated to the third and fourth generation. For the temporall puniſhment may be juſtly inflicted on good children of wicked parents: and eternall is as juſtly inflicted on the evil ofſpring of an evil man; yet, rather as himſelf is evil, then as his parents were evil. Again, both the threat and the mercie are onely conditionall. Laſtly, if God ſhould ſtint the puniſhment alwayes at the end of the third or fourth generation, which he needeth not, and doth not; yet it followeth not that ſinnes are ſtinted at the third or fourth generation, or that, that is the prefixed period of time, to which the communication of ſinnes may be extended. But as in the words [*unto thouſands*] there is the uncertain for the certain, the indefinite for the definite, (for it is not expreſſed how many thouſands, either of men, or yeares, or generations) ſo in the words [*the third and fourth generation*] there is the certain for the uncertain, the definite for the indefinite. And as God doth not tie himſelf to ſhew mercie unto the exact numbers of hundreds & thouſands, ſo is he not reſtrained from puniſhing beyond foure generations. But therefore the third and fourth generation is named, rather then any other, becauſe many a man now liveth to ſee his third or fourth generation flouriſh or decay: And therefore in our Liturgie, in the ſolemnization of marriage, the Prieſt

prayeth that the couple united may ſee their childrens children unto the third and fourth generations. And indeed, Job lived, after his great afflictions, to ſee *his ſonnes, and his ſonnes ſonnes, even foure generations*, Job 42. 16. Again, Gregor. Moral. 15. 22. interprets this of originall ſinne: and not onely the Vulgat, but the Hebrew hath it *iniquitatem patrum*, in the ſingular; and the third and fourth generation, (if ſo underſtood) *hath reference to the ages of the world*, ſaith [k] Auguſtine: from whom Procopius Gazeus little differeth upon the ſecond commandment, thus; *Our Saviour ſaid ſomewhere, This generation ſhall not paſſe, till all theſe things be fulfilled*, (the place is Mat. 24. 34. accordingly Mat. 23. 36. *All theſe things ſhall come upon this generation*) *and truely he ſpake of the end.* So he makes the fourth generation from Chriſts time to the end of the World; the third from the Law to Chriſt; the ſecond from Abraham to the Law (he ſhould have ſaid from the Floud to Abraham; for was not Noah and all his, till Abraham, part of humane generations?) the firſt from Adam to the Floud. And the oppoſite member, [*ſhewing mercie unto thouſands*] may be underſtood of millions of actuall offences forgiven. So much by the way for that expoſition.

[k] Aug. Cont. Adamantum cap. 7.

I return to the ſecond branch, *Sinnes are not communicated to the third and fourth generation.* For why not aſwell to the fifth and ſixth generations, and ſo downwards to the worlds end? Let ſome reaſon be ſhewed, why the force of communication of ſinnes ſhould reſt there. The place of Exodus intimateth not the communication of ſinnes, but the puniſhments; and the puniſhments ſo farre, becauſe many live ſo farre, and few farther: and the exemplarie ſinnes of fathers may be ſeen and remembred and followed by their fourth generation, and not further: and fathers dote not ſo much on their children, as grand-fathers and great-grand-fathers, nor cocker them up ſo much in evil. It is a ſenſeleſſe conſequence, That man communicateth ſinnes actuall, to the third and fourth generation, becauſe God puniſheth the ſinnes of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation, unleſſe they can prove, *Whatſoever God puniſheth, man doth communicate unto man:* which is impoſſible; for God ſometimes puniſheth ſuch ſinnes of the childe as the father never had, and of ſuch a childe as never had childe after, to whom he might communicate them.

The third and laſt branch of the ſeventh and laſt Propoſition is this, *That the immediate parents perſonall tranſgreſſions are not communicated to us.* They may by way of puniſhment, by way of offence or ſinne they cannot. No one ſinne actuall is traducted, propagated, transfuſed, communicated. If any one actuall ſinne be derived, why not more? why not all, and every one?

Why

Why ſhould the communication of ſinnes reſt in the father and mother, *aſcendendo*, when many children are liker their grand-fathers both in ſhape and feature, and in minde, and in vices, then to their father and mother, who were void of ſuch perſonall tranſgreſſions?

Thirdly, it is a true and old diſtinction, *That original ſinne viciateth our whole nature, and actuall ſinnes infect the perſon.* But this diſtinction is taken away and removed, if actuall ſinnes do viciate our nature, and are propagated by the ſeed, which is proper to ſinne-originall. It is not called originall ſinne, for being the root of all ſinne, (for Satan ſinned firſt) but as it is in our nature originally. In this point Whitaker agreeth with Stapleton, *De originali peccato*, 1. 4. And there Stapleton worthily obſerves, that [1] *Original ſinne noteth a ſpecificall difference, which is oppoſed to perſonal; intimating that the cauſe of ſinne is the nature, not the perſon.* As when we mention *actuall* ſinnes, we make an oppoſition to ſinnes *habituall*, or to ſinnes of *omiſſion*, or to ſinne *original*. If perſonall ſinnes do paſſe over unto the children, then Adams ſinne did ſo to his children. But not ſo. For it is but one ſingle ſingular ſinne which we ſinned in Adam.

[1] *Originale peccatum differentiam ſpecificam notat, qua opponitur perſonali; deſignans cauſam peccati naturam eſſe, non perſonam.*

If Adams perſonall vices were propagated to Cain; were all, or part propagated? if part, what were thoſe? and why thoſe above others? if all, what did Adam traduce to Abel, Seth? &c. Did he propagate onely thoſe ſinnes, which were committed between the generation of one and the other? And what ſinnes did Seth propagate to his poſteritie? Are perſonall ſinnes propagated alike to all the children? How is it that of one mans children, I have known one naturally exceeding angry, an other naturally ſtupid? Again, if a naturall fool begetteth one wiſe, what ſinnes doth he communicate? or on the contrary, a Machiavel begetteth a naturall fool; ſhall the fool be damned for his politick fathers malengin?

If actuall ſinne be traduced; then, is it in the ſeed ere the ſoul come? in the ſeed in the fathers bodie? in the ſeed at the emiſſion, at the reception, and retention? Then millions of ſeeds ſpent in lawfull matrimonie, when women do not conceive; or what they have conceived, yet having no ſoul, ſhall have ſinne actuall: and if they have ſinne, they muſt come to account. But ſuch fruitleſſe disburdenings do not appeare in judgement. Again, if perſonall ſinnes be propagated, are they remitted in Baptiſme, or not? if remitted, how are they ſo like their parents afterwards? How can the ſeed, which is not ſo much as an humane body actually, but onely potentially, be actually ſinfull? If perſonall ſinne be communicated from the next parents, how is it that experience teacheth us, that very godly mens children are given to ſuch enormities, as their parents in their youth, middle-age, and old age have deteſted?

It

It cannot come by communication of actuall ſinnes. You will ſay, it doth ariſe from ſinne original. So we ſay, and ſo do all ſinnes whatſoever ariſe from that corrupted fountain, that ever-bubbling wel-ſpring of evil, and not from a phantaſticall communication of actuall tranſgreſſions. If a meer Pagan and heathen, an idolatrous worſhipper of devils, beget two twinnes; ſhall they be alike wicked? We have heard and known the contrary. Gods diſcriminating ſaving grace doth not difference them, as you may ſay it doth in Chriſtians. Lot committed actuall ſinne, and knew it not; was that ſinne propagated to his ſonnes? That actuall ſinne ſhould be in the ſeed, which is but a ſuperfluity of nature, is very ſtrange. If Job had preſently, after that God had commended him to Satan, ſaying, *There is none like him in the earth, a perfect and upright man, one that feareth God, and eſcheweth evil*, Job 1.8. betook himſelf to the act of generation: or David at thoſe times, when he was a man according to Gods own heart: what perſonall iniquities had they propagated? Iſa.56.5. unto holy eunuchs God *will give a place better, and name better then of ſonnes and daughters*: yet, by this opinion, they of all other are moſt miſerable; for they receive all the actuall ſinnes of their fathers, and cannot waft-over either them or their own ſinnes into their children by their ſeed, (for they have none) but all muſt reſt in their ſouls, in their bodies, in their bloud, and upon themſelves onely.

If God ſhould miraculouſly create a man and woman, not of the ſeed of Adam, and they blaſpheme God, and beget children; ſhall they transfuſe actuall ſinne, which have not original ſinne? or ſhall their children blaſpheme naturally? Or, if they be innocent themſelves from that great offence, ſhall they be damned for their parents blaſphemy?

If perſonall ſinne be propagated, then the habits or acts. But neither. Not acts; for they are tranſient, and glide away. Not habits; for then, firſt, why ſhould not habits of knowledge, or goodneſſe, or the like be transfuſed, as well as of evil? eſpecially the habits of knowledge of evil? Secondly, then a childe is not onely originally ſinfull, by froward inclinations; but habitually, by multiplied actions. Thirdly, habits belong to the perſon *individuall*, not to him as he is a *ſpecies* of mankinde: but propagation is according to the *kinde* or *ſpecies*, not according to the *individuals*.

If ye object, Ezek.16.3. God chargeth them of Jeruſalem thus, *Thy father was an Amorite, thy mother an Hittite*; whereby he upbraideth them with their fathers ſinnes: I anſwer, Theſe words are not ſpoken of naturall deſcent, but of parents and children by imitation. For the Amorites and Hittites were idolaters; and the Iſraelites who ſucceeded them

in

in their inheritance, as children do fathers, inherited alſo their ſinnes, as appeareth in the whole chapter, eſpecially verſ.44. *Behold, every one that uſeth proverbs, ſhall uſe this proverb againſt thee, ſaying, As is the mother, ſo is her daughter. Thou art thy mothers daughter, that loatheth her husband and her children; and thou art the ſiſter of thy ſiſters, which loathed their husbands and their children: your mother was an Hittite, and your father an Amorite. And thine elder ſiſter is Samaria, ſhe and her daughters that dwell at thy left hand: and thy younger ſiſter that dwelleth at thy right hand, is Sodom and her daughters.* The whole kindred is by imitation, not by nature. But our queſtion is of true conſanguinitie, and reall generation. Further, if the immediate parents of thoſe of Jeruſalem were idolaters, like to Amorites and Hittites; yet their ſinnes are related, as arguments the rather to deterre their children from the like, and to keep them from the temporall puniſhments, which might juſtly be inflicted on them: but no way do the words intimate, that they ſhould be damned for their predeceſſours offences, unleſſe they continued in the ſame.

A ſecond objection may be this: Gen.9.22,25. *Cham the father of Canaan ſaw the nakedneſſe of Noah, and Noah curſed his grand-childe Canaan.* I anſwer, That Cham or Ham had divers other children, to wit, Cuſh, Mizraim, and Phut, Gen. 10.6. and Noah curſed none of Chams children ſave Canaan onely. Upon which I conclude one of theſe two things; either that the curſe extended onely to things of this life; or that Canaan was partaker of his fathers ſinne. For otherwiſe, the reſt of Canaans brethren muſt have been equally involved both in his guilt and in his puniſhment. Concerning the firſt, the words are Gen. 9. 25. *Curſed be Canaan; a ſervant of ſervants ſhall he be unto his brethren.* The other two might perchance, at diſtinct times, rule the one over the other; but Canaan ſhall be a ſervant, both to Shem, v.26. and to Japheth, v.27. To be *a ſervant of ſervants*, indeed was the curſe of Canaan; and it was really accompliſhed, when the Canaanites were made tributary and overcome, and the Gibeonites (a part of them) were made vaſſals to the meaneſt Iſraelites, which were the ofspring of Shem. Witty Epigrams and Paſquils have been made both againſt the citie of Rome and its Popes.

Averſum coluit quia Roma infamis Amorem;
Nomen ei averſo nomine fecit Amor.

Which name of Rome, if it had been firſt given, when not onely the Apoſtle S. Paul taxed them, Rom. 1. 26. &c. but even their fellow-heathen Petronius Arbiter, *in Satyr.* might have had ſome colour for that denomination: But ſince it was

was called Rome, when the ſinnes of that kinde were not hatcht or heard of; I ſay the inverted and averted name was rather witty and poſthumous, then ſound. Likewiſe they have this crochet againſt the Papal title of *Servus Servorum*,

Roma, tibi quondam fuerant Domini Dominorum:
Servorum ſervi nunc tibi ſunt Domini.

And Calvin derideth that Gregorian title. But the Abbot Rupertus well doth difference, that the Pope is not called abſolutely *Servus ſervorum*, *The ſervant of ſervants*; but *Servus ſervorum Dei, The ſervant of the ſervants of God:* to which I adde, that he is not ſaid to be *Servus ſervorum fratribus ſuis, A ſervant of ſervants unto his brethren*, which was the exact curſe of Canaan; but that he makes himſelf to be called *Servus ſervorum filiis ſuis in Chriſto, A ſervant of ſervants unto his ſonnes in Chriſt*; from whom he imagined he took his name of *Pater* and *Papa*. The ſecond branch of my anſwer is, that Canaan was partaker of his fathers ſinne. That it might be ſo, is demonſtrable. For though Canaan was not born while Noah was in the ark, *wherein few, that is eight ſouls, were ſaved by water*, 1.Pet.3.20. And thoſe eight ſouls were Noah and his wife, Shem, Ham, and Japheth, and their three wives, Geneſ.7.13. yet Canaan was born unto Ham not long after the floud, Geneſ.10. 1, and 6, verſes. The Rabbins ſay, Canaan was ten yeares of age, and firſt ſaw his grandfathers nakedneſſe, and in deriſion ſhewed it to his father; whereupon the father was curſed in that ſonne more then others. But that the innocent ſonne ſhould be curſed eternally for the fathers offence, was never intended.

A third objection may be this: Joh. 9. 2. the Diſciples asked Chriſt, *Who did ſinne, this blinde man, or his parents, that he was born blinde?* From whence is inferred, that the Apoſtles beleeved, that the ſinne of parents is prejudiciall to the childe. I anſwer, The Apoſtles interrogation was grounded on knowledge, yet perhaps mixt with ſome ignorance. They truely did know, both that bodily puniſhments are ſent of God upon men for their offences, and that a childe might juſtly be puniſhed corporally for the parents iniquitie. But their ignorance is ſeen in this, that they thought no puniſhment was inflicted, but for ſome ſingular ſingled noted offence. But for whoſe offence, or what offence, there is the doubt which Chriſt thus untieth, *Neither this man ſinned, nor his parents*; (where he meaneth not that they had no particular ſinne, but not ſuch ſinne or ſinnes as for which this man was made blinde) *but that the works of God ſhould be made manifeſt in him.* Secondly, this inſtance is ſo farre from proving the ſinnes of the fathers to be derived to their ſonnes, that it excuſeth both parents and children

children from ſuch and ſuch ſinnes. Thirdly, it hath apparent reference to corporall puniſhments, which neither the Apoſtles nor I do deny, but they may juſtly be inflicted on the bodies or goods of children for their parents tranſgreſſions.

11. It followeth in my method, that I ſhew the authorities on our ſide. Bellarmine, *De Amiſsione Grat. & Statu peccati* 4. 18. proveth at large, [m] *That all the ſinnes of parents do not paſſe unto their poſteritie by generation, but onely the firſt ſinne of the firſt man.* Trelcatius and Willet croſſe him not in this point. Scharpius pag. 487. *in Curſu Theologico* upon that point of Bellarmine maketh this *Quære*; [n] *Whether the ſinnes of the next parents originally paſſe unto their poſteritie?* and he anſwereth, *That Auguſtine moved the matter, yet determined it not: but we* (ſaith he) *agree with Aquinas, that it is impoſsible ſo to be.* And he alledgeth divers ſound reaſons for that purpoſe. Auguſtine himſelf indeed ſomewhere is ſomewhat doubtfull: and though he ſaith againſt Julian 6. 3. That Fundanus a Rhetorician of Carthage, [o] *being by an accidentall hurt blinde of one eye, begat a ſonne likewiſe blinde of one eye:* (where he ſeemeth to patronize the transfuſion of perſonalls) yet the caſe is above ordinarie, as experience ſheweth; and much may be aſcribed to the imagination of the mother, rather then to the imperfect generation of the father. Though Auguſtine alſo *in Enchirid.* be ſomewhat cautelous and timerous; yet otherwhere (as I have proved before) he is confident, that we ſhall ſtand forth to judgement for one onely ſinne of Adam, our originall ſinne: which truth he confirmeth in one particular, thus, againſt Julian the Pelagian 6. 12. [p] *Therefore neither can Cain himſelf, though he knew his father Adam, be ſaid to have ſinned becauſe his father ſinned.* And more fully, *De peccat. Meritis & Remiſſ.* 1. 13. [q] *We have not derived from Adam (in whom we all ſinned) all our ſinnes, but onely originall.* Thus much be ſaid to prove the divine S. Auguſtine to be of our ſide.

Onely Vorſtius, of all the canvaſers of Bellarmine that I have met with, differeth from him and us, and maketh a double propagation, Generall, and Speciall: and ſaith, *If Bellarmines drift be againſt the generall propagation, it is falſe; becauſe nature teacheth, and experience witneſſeth,* [r] *that ordinarily worſe children are begotten of worſe men. If he ſpeak of the ſpeciall traduction, our men eaſily aſſent unto him,* ſaith Vorſtius. I reply on Vorſtius. Firſt, who ever before him talked of a double propagation? Not Scriptures, nor Fathers, nor Councels. Secondly, is this generall propagation done at the ſame time that the ſpeciall is accompliſhed? Is this general propagation better or worſe then originall ſinne? Is this generall propagation, of all ſinnes, and of all parents up to Adam, and of ſinnes repented of, and of ſinnes of omiſſion, and of tranſient ſinnes; or of ſuch as Atheiſme in the

[m] *Non tranſire ad poſteros per generationem omnia peccata parentum, ſed primum tantùm primi hominis lapſum.*

[n] *An peccata proximorum parentum originaliter in poſteros tranſeunt?*

[o] *Cùm accidenti vitio luſcus eſſet, luſcum filium procreavit.*

[p] *Propter hoc itaque, id eſt, quoniam peccavit Adam, nec ipſe Cain peccaſſe dicendus eſt, qui eundem patrem ſuum noverat.*

[q] *Ab Adam, in quo omnes peccavimus, non omnia noſtra peccata, ſed tantùm originale traduximus.*

[r] *Corruptiones ex corruptioribus ordinariè generari.*

ſoul, which hath ſmall, or no participation with the bodie? Let him define or deſcribe this trimtram of generall propagation contra-oppoſed to the propagation of ſinne originall. But, ſaith he, *Nature and experience ſay, Worſe children are begotten of worſe men.* I anſwer, I never knew any worſe, then ſome children of ſome good men. Secondly, he puts *non cauſam pro cauſa*, aſcribing the wickedneſſe of children to the propagation of actuall ſinne of their immediate parents, when he may better impute it to their hearing or beholding of their parents wickedneſſe, or to ill breeding and ill cuſtome. Thirdly, the vices of the immediate parents, and of the remoter, yea of the remoteſt, even from Adam, yea all the ſinnes that ever were committed, yea which yet never were committed, but ſhall be or may be hereafter, differing either in kinde or number from all ſinnes precedent, all have been, are, ſhall be (in regard of the beginning, root, and fountain) in originall ſinne. Fourthly, none ever that handled this controverſie (as Auguſtine, or the School) did ever take actuall ſinnes for inclinations to ſinnes. Fifthly, in Vorſtius his diſtinction there is a fallacie, viz. *Petitio principii*, while he, without good proof, taketh that for granted which is the onely thing denied, namely, *That there is an other propagation, beſides the propagation of ſinne originall.* Sixthly, how inconſequentiall is this? *Wicked men have ordinarily wicked children; Therefore perſonall ſinnes are propagated.* But indeed we denie the antecedent, and ſay, The ſonnes of the wicked are as righteous, by naturall generation, as the ſonnes of the righteous. If Vorſtius reply, that every age groweth worſe and worſe, and

Ætas parentum pejor avis tulit
Nos nequiores, mox daturos
Progeniem vitioſiorem.

And again, *Aurea prima ſata eſt ætas:——*
——ſubiitque argentea proles,
Auro deterior, fulvo pretioſior ære:
Tertia poſt illam ſucceſsit ahenea proles;
——de duro eſt ultima ferro:

The anſwer is expedite, Theſe are but poeticall fictions, fictions of thoſe who knew no propagation of originall ſinne, and aſcribed this growing worſe and worſe to the depravation of manners then preſent in uſe, and to evil cuſtomes, rather then to the propagation of perſonall iniquities:

Laudamus veteres, ſed noſtris utimur annis.

Much there is to the like purpoſe in heathen authours. Laſtly, Vorſtius himſelf, after his ſeeking to finde a knot in a bulruſh, after his needleſſe oppoſition in this point, concludeth thus, *Hoc tranſeat, quia parvi momenti eſt; Let this paſſe, becauſe it is of ſmall moment.* So that, even in his judgement, this controverſie

troverſie is ſmall, and indeed I think it not worth the name of a controverſie.

When I had come thus farre, labouring to prove that *no actuall or perſonall ſinnes are propagated*, I caſually again conferred with that learned loving friend of mine, who formerly brought to my hand the opinions of the new Writers; and upon ſome diſcourſe, he ſetled on this expoſition, which otherwiſe he gave over as indefenſible, That they do mean by *actuall ſinnes*, that *inclinations unto ſinnes are communicated*. I anſwered, That I uſed to gather mens meanings by their words, and that neither their words, nor the words of Zanchius the relatour, do incline to theſe inclinations. Again, never did any authour of any time before expound *perſonalia*, and *actualia peccata* (for of theſe muſt the queſtion be neceſſarily underſtood) by the *inclinations unto ſinne*. Moreover, if by *peccata* they did mean the *proneneſſe unto ſinne*; to avoid doubtfulneſſe, they ſhould, and as readily and eaſily they could (if they would) have written *peccatorum inclinationes*, as *peccata* in generall; or might have ſignified in ſome other words, and in ſome other paſſages, that they had meant ſo. This I know, They talk of *peccata*, *peccata proximorum parentum*, of *labes peccatorum*, *& ceu contagium*; they have words enow, doubtfull and obſcure enough, which I dare ſay themſelves underſtood not when they writ, viz. *peccatorum labes, & ceu contagium:* yet make they no mention of *inclinations*. But I would further know, whether their inclinations are derived unto their children, and puniſhed in them; which reſt onely as inclinations, and never come into act: Or ſuch inclinations as begin to come into act, but are reſiſted and overcome by Gods grace: Or onely ſuch inclinations as breed actuall and perſonall iniquitie. If thus, then the inclinations are not puniſhed, but the actuall averſions. Or, are no inclinations derived from grand-father, &c? I, but ſince originall ſinne is alike in all, and ſome are more like to parents; whence doth this likeneſſe to them proceed more then to others? I anſwer, A drunkards childe is as like in that ſinne to all other drunkards, as to his father.

But why hath a drunken father more commonly a drunken ſonne, then a ſober man? Firſt, that is not yet proved. Secondly, parents ſinnes ſeen or heard of, eaſily invite the children to do the ſame. Thirdly, too many parents bring up their children to do as themſelves do. Fourthly, if a moſt drunken ſonne hath moſt ſober parents, then it comes from ſinne originall: Why not ſo alſo from drunken parents? If inclination of drunkenneſſe be more in the ſeed of drunken men then of ſober, then the children of drunkards ſhould naturally be more drunk and deeper drunk, then any other drunkards whoſe parents were temperate. But that is not ſo, at leaſt not *Object.*

ſo naturally, becauſe not alwayes, no, nor perchance commonly. Let me once more repeat, That all poſſible inclinations unto ſinne are inveloped and involved in originall ſinne, which they either knew not, or conſidered not. Laſtly, when I had taken theſe pains to frame this chapter in defence of a point, which I never held to be queſtioned, it grieved me to heare my ingenious friend ſo much to defend the new Writers, and to dance after the new pipe. Candid and favourable expoſitions I ſhall love while I live, and both uſe towards others, and deſire to be uſed towards me; but violent, forced, farre-fetched interpretations (as this hath been) I can no way allow. For ſince reformation hath been ſo ſharpſighted, as to finde fault in all things, to eſteem the Schoolmen as dunſes, (though they are thought dunſes that ſo cenſure them) to account the Fathers as ſilly old men, or as children, (though they are but babes that admire them not) to diſregard Provinciall Councels, yea Generall Councels, as the acts of weak and ſinfull men (though they are the chiefeſt, the higheſt earthly-living-breathing Judges of Scriptures controverſed;) which cavils againſt former times I have heard belched forth by the brain-ſick zealous ignorants of our times: ſince we have hiſſed out the Papiſts, and think they ſpeak againſt their own conſciences, when they maintain the infallibilitie and inerrabilitie of the Pope: May not Bucer and Martyr erre? Muſt all new opinions needs be true, and defended with might and main, with wreſted part-taking, over-charitable defenſes, rather then a ſmall errour ſhall be acknowledged? If ſuch milde dealing had been uſed againſt times precedent, we could not have found (as ſome now have done) about two thouſand errours of the Papiſts. But thus much (if not too much) ſhall ſuffice concerning theſe men and this matter, with this cloze, That Zanchius himſelf, in the place above cited, ſaith thus againſt that new-fangled opinion, [t] *For no other ſinne was tranſfuſed to poſteritie, then that which alſo was Adams: for it was diſobedience with a privation of originall juſtice and corruption of the whole nature. Beſides, we are ſentenced to death for no other ſinne then for that for which Adam alſo was: for death was the wages of the ſame ſinne. Now it was ſaid to him,* THOU SHALT DIE THE DEATH, *for diſobedience, &c.*

Now let them ſay, (if they can) that Adam was ſentenced to death for any ſinne of predeceſſour or ſucceſſour, or any other ſinne of himſelf, but one onely. I have maintained and do reſolve, *Death was inflicted for his firſt ſinne onely.* Therefore by Zanchius his true Divinitie, againſt Bucer and Martyr, and their peremptorie defenders, Not all, not many ſinnes, of all, of many, of any, of our predeceſſours; but the firſt ſinne

[t] *Neque enim aliud peccatum in poſteros transfuſum eſt, quam quod ipſius quoque fuit Adami: fuit enim inobedientia cum privatione juſtitiæ originalis, & totius naturæ corruptione. Deinde etiam, non propter aliud peccatum nos ſumus adjudicati morti, quàm propter illud propter quod & Adamus: Ejuſdem enim peccati ſtipendium fuit mors. Illi autem fuit dictum,* Morte Morieris, *propter inobedientiam, &c.*

sinne onely of Adam is transfused to posteritie: nor are they guiltie or condemnable, for any other preceding actuall sinne or sinnes of others whosoever.

O Father of consolation, O God of mercies, who knowest that every one of us have sinnes personall more then enow to condemne us; lay not, I beseech thee, the sinnes of our fathers, or fore-fathers, or our own (if it be thy holy will) to our charge, to punish us in this life present; or our originall sinne, in, and by Adam, or our own actuall misdeeds, to trouble our consciences by despair, or to damne us in the world to come: but have mercy upon us, have mercy upon us, according to thy great mercy in Christ Jesus, our alone Lord and Saviour. Amen.

CHAP. VIII.

1. *Original ſinne came not by the Law of Moſes, but was before it in the World.*

2. *God hath good reaſon and juſtice to puniſh us for our original ſinne in Adam. Gods actions defended by the like actions of men.*

3. *Husbands repreſent their wives. The men of Iſrael repreſented the women. Concerning the firſt-born of men and beaſts. The primogeniture and redemption of the firſt-born.*

4. *The whole bodie is puniſhed for the murder committed by one hand. Corporations repreſent whole cities and towns, and Parliaments the bodie of the Realm. Their acts binde the whole Kingdome. Battelling champions and duelliſts ingage poſteritie.*

5. *S. Peter repreſented the Apoſtles. The Apoſtles repreſent ſometimes the Biſhops, ſometimes the whole Clergie. The Miniſters of the Convocation repreſent the whole Church of England. The authoritie of Generall Councels. National Synods muſt be obeyed.*

6. *Private ſpirits cenſured. Interpretation of Scripture not promiſcuouſly permitted. An Anabaptiſticall woman diſplayed.*

7. *An other woman reproved for her new-fangled book in print. Scriptures not to be expounded by anagrams in Hebrew, much leſſe in Engliſh; but with reverence. How farre the people are to beleeve their Paſtours.*

8. *Saul repreſented an entire armie. Joſhua and the Princes binde the Kingdome of Iſrael for long time after.*

9. *Chriſt repreſented us. Chriſt and Adam like in ſome things, in others unlike. Chriſt did and doth more good for us, then Adam did harm.*

IT hath been plentifully evidenced, that death entred into the world by ſinne; and that both Adam and we were ſentenced to die for one ſinne, the firſt ſinne onely of Adam onely; and not for any other ſinne or ſinnes of him, or any other our remote, propinque, or immediate parents; and

and that *death reigned from Adam to Moſes, even over them that had not ſinned after the ſimilitude of Adams tranſgreſſion*, Rom. 5. 14. I adde, Death ſhall live, fight, and prevail, (though not reigne) from Moſes unto the end of the world. For *when this mortall ſhall have put on immortality, then* (then, and not till then) *ſhall be brought to paſſe the ſaying that is written, Death is ſwallowed up in victory*, 1. Cor. 15. 54. and *the laſt enemy that ſhall be deſtroyed is death*, 1. Cor. 15. 26. Aquine on Roman. 5. lect. 4. thus, *Becauſe corporall death reigned from Adam, by whom originall ſinne came into the world, unto Moſes, under whom the Law was given, and death is the effect of ſinne, eſpecially originall ſinne; it appeareth, there was originall ſinne in the world before the Law: and leſt we might ſay, they died for actuall ſinnes, the Apoſtle ſaith, Death reigned even over thoſe who ſinned not* proprio actu, *as children.* So he.

2. The things themſelves then being unqueſtionable, and before elucidated to the full, That death is inflicted for originall ſinne, and that we all and every of us (except Chriſt) have contracted originall ſinne; it followeth juſtly, by the judgement of God, that death is appointed unto us for this ſinne. Tertullian *lib. 1. contra Marcion.* [a] *Man is condemned to death for taſting of a ſmall tree: — and now they all periſh that never were acquainted with Paradiſe:* and let me adde, *They are moſt juſtly puniſhed.* Neither let man cavill, or caſt aſperſion of unrighteouſnes upon God. For though men be but of yeſterday (yea though the childe be born but this minute) yet by reaſon of their originall ſinne in Adam, and with him, they were juſtly ſentenced in Adam unto death almoſt ſix thouſand yeares ago. For though God needeth no defence from the actions and behaviour of men; yet from their uſances and cuſtomes generally received, from their right and equitie daily practiſed, let us aſcend to behold the blameleſſe courſe in the like of the Almightie. Do we finde a young ſnake, viper, or other venemous or hurtfull beaſts, birds, or the egges of a cocatrice; we deſtroy them, not for the harm which they have done, but for the kinde ſake, and for the ſpoil which they may do. Do not prodigall great heirs waſte and ſcatter abroad eſtates enſured to poſteritie? Do they not cut off intailes, annihilate and void perpetuities, draw inheritances drie in ſmoke, and conſume them wholly on gut or groin, to the everlaſting prejudice of their iſſues? Did not the diſobedience of Queen Vaſhti unto her huſband do a wrong, not to the King Ahaſuerus onely, but *to all the princes, and all the people*, Eſther 1. 16. and, as being exemplarie, was puniſhed accordingly? If the whordome of the High-prieſts daughter be *a profanation of her father*,

[a] *Homo damnatur in mortem, ob unius arbuſculi delibationem: — & pereunt jam omnes qui nullum Paradiſi ceſpitem nôrunt.*

Levit. 21. 9. and therefore ſhe was to be burnt alive, though other whores were put to milder deaths: if an evil done to a brother ſtriketh up to the abuſe of the father, as it doth; (for *God rendered the wickedneſſe of Abimelech which he did unto his father, in ſlaying his ſeventie brethren*, Judges 9. 56.) then why might not the wickedneſſe of a father deſcend in ſome ſort upon the children, in a ſtorm of wrath and puniſhment?

3. The husband repreſenteth the wife: what bargain he maketh, ſhe maketh: they are one fleſh. The great commandment, to keep the ſabbath, was given to ſonne and daughter, to ſervants and to ſtrangers, but not to the wife. She was forbidden in her husband, which the reſt were not, but dividedly: ſo was Eve forbid in Adam, not inhibited her ſelf, but in him who repreſented her. The men of Iſrael repreſented the women, and the women had good by the actions or paſſions of the men. The females were redeemed in the males, every male gave a ranſome for his ſoul unto the Lord; all and every one, rich and poore alike, even half a ſhekel; and *they gave this offering unto the Lord, to make an atonement for their ſouls*, Exod. 30. 15. Women were partakers of this benefit, and in the mens atonement was the womans comprized. Neither were the females preſented to the Lord, but the males, the males onely: and the women in them, and by them, but not in their own perſons. In Gods due claim to the beaſts, theſe three conditions were to be obſerved: Firſt, that the beaſts ſhould be clean; and ſo not ſwine, not horſes, camels, dromedaries, elephants, or the like; but onely theſe three kindes, ſheep, ruther-beaſts, and goats, were the Lords (unleſſe you will make up the number, foure, with an aſſe; which was to be redeemed with a lambe, or his neck to be broken, Exod. 13. 13.) For though it be ſaid Exod. 13. 2. *Sanctifie unto me all the firſtborn, whatſoever openeth the wombe among the children of Iſrael, both of man and beaſt: it is mine:* Yet you muſt not extend the words to dogs, or cats, or things unclean, but onely to ſuch clean beaſts as God hath appointed for ſacrifices. Yea, though it be ſaid, Numb. 18. 15. *The firſtling of unclean beaſts thou ſhalt redeem:* You muſt know, there is a double uncleanneſſe. Firſt, that which is unclean throughout all its *ſpecies*; as ſwine, and horſes, and the like: Secondly, that which is unclean by accident, and is contra-oppoſed to perfect and unblemiſhed, Levit. 22. 22, 23. as *blinde, or broken, or maimed, or having a wen, or ſcurvie, or ſcabbed, — or which hath any thing ſuperfluous or lacking in his parts:* ſuch beaſts, even of clean beaſts, as ſheep, goats, &c. the Lord counted unclean, and claimed them not. Thoſe that were thus unclean by accident,

were

were to be redeemed: and ſo that place of Numb. is to be underſtood, and not to be wire-drawn, as if God did claim the unclean beaſts to be his. The ſecond condition, That thoſe clean beaſts ſhould be firſt-born: *Thou ſhalt ſet apart unto the Lord all that openeth the matrix, and every firſtling that cometh of a beaſt*, Exod. 13. 12. Thirdly, theſe clean firſt-born or firſtlings muſt not be the females, though they firſt open the matrix, but the males; ὅσα ἂν γένηται ἐκ τὰ ἀρσενικὰ, as the Septuagints have it, Exod. 13. 12. *The males ſhall be the Lords.* Semblably in the caſe of mankinde, women were not the Lords claim, but the men onely, and the women included in the men. For though it be ſaid in generall terms, Exod. 13. 13. *All the firſt-born among thy children thou ſhalt redeem*; yet the women were not redeemed but in the men, and the men onely were offered. Luke 2. 23. *Every male that openeth the wombe ſhall be holy:* Openeth the wombe by extramiſſion and ejection, not by intromiſſion and injection, as the Hebrew phraſe importeth: the Greek is thus, πᾶν ἄρσεν διανοῖγον μήτραν, *Omnis maſculus primogenitus*, as Beza reads it; *Omne maſculinum*, as the Vulgat hath it; according to that, Exod. 22.29. *The firſt-born of thy ſonnes thou ſhalt give unto me.* From whence let me inferre this concluſion, That the firſt-born had his denomination from the mothers firſt birth or parturition, as well as from the fathers firſt generation. Exod. 11. 5. *From the firſt-born of Pharaoh, to the firſt-born of the maid-ſervant that is behinde the mill.* The Septuagints ſtile the firſt-born, not πρωτογενῆ, with reference to the fathers act, but πρωτότοκον, from the mother; and Chriſt is not called πρωτογενὴς, from a carnall father (for he had none) or μονότοκος, but μονογενὴς, John 1. 18. and πρωτότοκος αὐτῆς, Luke 2. 7. *her firſt-born ſonne.* Which πρωτότοκος is ill interpreted by the old Biſhops bibles, Mat. 1. 25. *firſt-begotten*; and by the Genevean tranſlation as ill rendered, Luke 2. 7. forſaking their good rendering of it, Mat. 1. 25. But our late tranſlation, in both places aptly hath it *the firſt-born*, and not *firſt-begotten.* Though Jacob ſaith, Geneſ. 49. 3. *Reuben, thou art my firſt-born:* yet Leah might have ſaid the ſame words as well; for he was the firſt-born of both: Yea, I dare ſay, if a man had more wives at once, as Jacob had; or ſucceſſively, as many others; the firſt male childe of each of theſe women by the ſame man may juſtly be called his firſt-born; and every one of theſe firſt-born children, if they had lived under the Leviticall law, had been conſecrated to God. And therefore Reuben having loſt his birth-right, the double portion which had been due to him, (and was due to the firſt-born under the law, Deut. 21. 17. and was part of thoſe *Jura primo-genituræ*, and one of the πρωτοτόκια mentioned by the Apoſtle, Heb. 12. 16.) was by Gods appointment, and Jacobs

juſt

juſt allotment bequeathed to Joſeph, Geneſ. 48. 5. And of him were two tribes, Ephraim and Manaſſeh: whereas no other of the children of Iſrael had more then one tribe. *For Judah prevailed above his brethren, and of him came the chief ruler; but the birth-right was Joſephs*, 1. Chron. 5. 2. and not Judahs. For Joſeph was the firſt-born of Rachel, the firſt-love of Jacob, the firſt wife in the light, in right, and in intention: And ſo her eldeſt ſonne Joſeph was in right to be the firſt-born of Jacob: and her ſelf is prefer'd in place, not onely by Jacobs affection, but long after, by the Spirit of God, Ruth 4. 11. *The Lord make the woman like Rachel and Leah.* Shall I ſtep one ſtep further? I may ſay, That if the willing and witting act of Jacob, preferring Ephraim, the younger ſonne of Joſeph, before his firſt-born Manaſſeh, did onely ſignifie, that Gods bleſſing went not alwaies hand in hand by the prioritie of birth, and that God makes birth-rights according to his pleaſure, and not according to mans reckoning: Yet three other paſſages reach more home, to prove, That Joſeph was the firſt-born. Firſt, becauſe Jacob bleſſed Joſeph two ſeverall times, Geneſ. 48. 16. and 49. 22. which he did unto none of his other children beſides; and withall, he gave him *one portion above his brethren, which he took out of the hand of the Amorite with his ſword and with his bow*, verſ. 22. beſides the parcell of ground in Shechem, where Joſeph was buried; *And it became the inheritance of the children of Joſeph*, Joſh. 24. 32. which was alſo a prerogative above his other brethren. Secondly, becauſe Jacob bleſſed Joſephs children before he bleſſed his own children, Geneſ. 48. 16, &c. Thirdly, becauſe Jacob bleſſed both Joſeph in his children, and his children in his bleſſing; and bleſſed none of his childrens children, by name, ſeparately, and particularly, but Joſephs children onely (though divers of them had little ones before Jacob went into Egypt, Geneſ. 46. 5.) and Joſeph himſelf Jacob bleſſed *with the bleſſings of the breaſts, and of the wombe*, Geneſ. 49. 25. Which words, as they do promiſe a kinde of fruitfulneſſe; (which was taken from Ephraim, by barrenneſſe, when it was ſaid, Hoſea 9. 14. *Give them a miſcarrying wombe and drie breaſts*) ſo I remember not, that ever the poſteritie of Joſeph had extraordinarie number of iſſue above other tribes, anſwerable to Jacobs extraordinarie bleſſing; but Judah, and his ofspring onely, had more men of warre, *from twentie yeares old and upward*, then both the tribes of Ephraim and Manaſſeh, Num. 1. 26, 33, 35. and therefore, in all likelihood, had more children from twentie yeares downward. Which words, I ſay, viz. *The bleſſings of the breaſts, and of the wombe*, as they may in a ſecond ſenſe imply a numerous ofspring; ſo in the firſt ſenſe, I conjecture, they pointed

ed at the primo-geniture of Joſeph and his children. Sure I am, *the birth-right was given to the ſonnes of Joſeph*, 1. Chron. 5. 1. and *the birth-right was Joſephs*, verſ. 2. and perhaps, even in this point, Jacobs bleſſings *prevailed above the bleſſings of his progenitours*, Geneſ. 49. 26. For Abraham prayed once that his firſt-born ſonne, by his concubine, might be bleſſed: *O that Iſhmael might live before thee!* ſaith he to God, Gen. 17. 18. and Iſaac would have bleſſed his firſt-born Eſau: *Make me ſavourie meat, ſuch as I love, and bring it to me, that I may eat; that my ſoul may bleſſe thee before I die*, ſaith Iſaac to Eſau, Geneſ. 27. 4. though before-hand Eſau had ſold his birth-right unto Jacob, Geneſ. 25. 33. Neither Abraham, nor Iſaac prevailed in their wiſhes: but Jacobs bleſſings prevailed above the bleſſings of his progenitours, becauſe, whom he deſired to bleſſe, God bleſſed; and he gave, by Gods allowance, the primo-geniture to Joſeph whom he loved, and to whom, in ſome regard, it was due before Reuben.

I return to the old matter, and opine, That when a batcheler marrieth with a widow, which had had a ſonne by her former husband, her firſt man-childe by the ſecond husband was not a firſt-born, nor ſo accounted in the law. And if after a woman had had ſeven husbands, and daughters onely by each of theſe, ſhe had been married alſo unto the eighth husband, and ſhould have a ſonne by him, though he had had divers ſonnes before by other women, yet this his ſonne by this woman is, in the eye of the law, a right firſt-born childe, and ſacred to the Lord; and to be redeemed, not with the generall redemption of every male, half a ſhekel, of which I ſpake before, but with the particular redemptions of the firſt-born. Redemptions were of two ſorts: the firſt is expreſſed Numb. 3. 45. where *the Levites are taken in ſtead of all the firſt-born, and the cattell of the Levites in ſtead of their cattell.* And becauſe there were two hundred and ſeventy more of the firſt-born ſonnes of the Iſraelites, then all the male Levites came unto, every one of thoſe odde 270 paid five ſhekels to the Lord for their redemption: which ſumme of five ſhekels was ever after, during the Law, the price of the redemption of the firſt-born ſonne, Numbers 18. 16; which was the ſecond kinde of redemption.

I cannot omit to ſhew the means which God uſed, to prevent the coſenage about things conſecrated. They were to do no work with the firſt-born bullock, nor to ſhear their firſt-born ſheep, Deuter. 15. 19.

It is alſo remarkable, firſt, that Pharaoh commanded the midwives of the Hebrews, Exod. 1. 16. *If it be a ſonne, ye ſhall kill him*: and gave in charge after to all the Egyptians, his ſubjects, *Every ſonne that is born ye ſhall caſt into the river, and every daughter*

daughter ye ſhall ſave alive, verſ. 22. Secondly, that Moſes was the ſonne of a Levite, expoſed to the danger of the water; and therefore called Moſes, becauſe he was drawn forth, Exod. 2. and after called by God, to revenge this wrong and others upon Pharaoh. Among which plagues, this was a great one, to ſlay their firſt-born: and as the juſt retaliation uſed by God in other things, yea in this, was, not to deſtroy their daughters, but their ſonnes; ſo in his mercy he would not deſtroy all their males, but the firſt-born onely; which you muſt not underſtand of their daughters; though they were firſt-born, but onely of their males. For when it is ſaid, Pſal. 78. 51. *He ſmote all the firſt-born in Egypt, the chief of their ſtrength*; you cannot imagine that women were the chief of their ſtrength, but the men onely. And God taught the people to ſay, Exod. 13. 15. *The Lord ſlew all the firſt-born, &c. therefore I ſacrifice unto the Lord all that openeth the matrix, being males*. And as the firſt-born males onely were ſacrificed, ſo onely were the firſt-born males redeemed. And accordingly all the male Levites were taken for the male firſt-born of Iſrael: and at the moſt righteous maſſacre of the firſt-born males of Egypt, the Iſraelites eſcaped by the bloud of a lambe without blemiſh, *a male of the firſt yeare*, or a ſonne of the firſt yeare, Exod. 12. 5. From whence you may ſee the groſſe errour of Cornel. Cornelii à Lapide, who thinketh, That if a woman had had a daughter firſt, and ſonnes after, her firſt ſonne had not been her firſt-born, but her daughter; becauſe ſhe opened the matrix firſt: when it is evident, that if a woman had had many daughters before one ſonne, yet her firſt ſonne was her firſt-born in the Law. And God ſaith, Exod. 12. 24, *Ye ſhall obſerve this thing for an ordinance to thee, and to thy ſonnes for ever*: viz. the ordinance of keeping the Paſſeover. I recollect, & apply theſe things thus, The men of Iſrael repreſented the women; The firſt-born ſonne, and not the daughter, was the Lords due; The male Levites were in ſtead of the firſt-born ſonnes; All firſt-born males were redeemed; Women received good by the mens circumciſion, and by mens redemption, which was in one kinde or other, whether they were firſt-born or not firſt-born. And though the deviliſh ſuperſtition of the Turks now circumciſe women (as Joannes Leo reporteth) yet by Gods appointment women were neither to be circumciſed, nor redeemed, but as they were in men, and as men repreſented them.

4. Let me come yet nearer to the main purpoſe. The Apoſtle ſaith, 1. Corinth. 12. 26. *Whether one member ſuffer, all the members ſuffer with it; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoyce with it*. From whence I thus argue; As at the committing or deed-doing in murder, the murderers hand may be ſaid to will the murder; not becauſe there is any

will,

will, ſtrictly taken, belonging to the hand; or becauſe there is ſinne properly in the right hand, which doth but its duty in obeying the ſouls domineering diſpoſition, or *dominium deſpoticum:* but becauſe the hand is part of that man, in whoſe ſoul the will was that commanded the murder; and becauſe the ſoul is *principium totius individui,* the fountain from which all members take life, and uſe motion, and by the ſoul the motion was derived to all the other parts of the body. So were we, and every one of man-kinde, willing to commit the ſinne with Adam; not as if we had been there actually to agree or diſagree, but as we were parts of him who was the fountain of humane nature, which conveyed corruption unto all mankinde. Semblably in the puniſhment: though the right hand onely give the blow, and actuate the murder, yet upon the delinquents apprehenſion both hands are pineoned, both feet fettered, the neck is haltered, and the whole body rueth it; yea, ſoul and all, without repentance. So, though Adam onely ſinned that firſt great ſinne, yet becauſe he did it repreſenting us, Adam alone is not puniſhed for it: but we that are bone of his bone, and fleſh of his fleſh, all that are members of the firſt Adam are guilty of the fault, and condignely are puniſhed, if we be unrepentant. For as the divers members of a body, are part of the perſon of one man: ſo all and every man is, as it were, a part and member of humane nature. And thus by the participation of the *ſpecies*, more men are one; and one, more: we, Adam; and Adam was we. But let us go out of man himſelf, and look to other faſhions of the world, in matters politicall. Do not the ſeverall men in a Townſhip or Corporation make one body thereof, and the whole Corporation is, as it were, but one man? and what a few do, is it not the act of all? of which he complained, who ſaid, *That Mr. Maior, for his own particular, was an honeſt man, and ſo were all the brethren, who promiſed him fairely; but* (becauſe, contrary to their promiſe, they pinched upon him) *the Corporation was a knave.* Doth not the Houſe of the Commons repreſent the Body of the Realm, in the Parliament time, though the thouſand part of the ſubjects be not preſent? and what they enact, the abſent enact; what they deny, the abſent deny: and what immunities and priviledges they obtain, for ſucceſſion as well as for themſelves they obtain them: and what ſervices, tributes, ſubſidies, or taxes they yeeld unto, all the reſt of the Realm muſt yeeld unto, and pay: yea, by the truſt repoſed in them, they binde or looſe the whole Kingdome, ſometimes in ſuch things as others would never have conſented unto, and yet muſt undergo, and ſee performed. In the fifth book of the Hiſtorie of Portugal, the Univerſitie and Divines of Alcala, among other things, truely decreed, and religiouſly guided Philip the

ſecond towards the attaining of the crown of Portugal, in theſe words, ſaying, that, *When as Common-wealths do chooſe their firſt King, upon condition to obey him and his ſucceſſours, they remain ſubject to him to whom they have tranſferred their authority; no juriſdiction remaining in them either to judge the realm, or the true ſucceſſour, ſeeing in the firſt election all true ſucceſſours were choſen.*

Every man is conſidered doubly. Firſt, as a ſingular perſon: ſo onely his own proper actions belong to him. Secondly, as a member of a ſociety: ſo what the Prince, or the whole citie, or the greater part do, doth concern him: For *ſo ſaith the Philoſopher*, ſaith Scharpius the Divine. Much more did Adam repreſent our perſons, when, what he willed and performed, we willed and performed; we being in him, as many waters in a fountain; all to be corrupted, if he were corrupted; all to be pure, if he continued pure; all to live by his righteouſnes, all to die by his iniquity.

Furthermore, in the famous battell between the three Horatii and the three Curiatii, did not they repreſent both the armies and both the people? the Horatii, of the Romanes? the Curiatii, of the Latines? Did not their wills, their ſtrength, their fortune depend on the wills, ſtrength, and fortune of thoſe combatants? did not the Latines fall into ſubjection by the death of the Curiatii? and did not the Romanes thrive and proſper by the valour of their ſurviving Horatius? Yea in the Scripture, long before this battell, *there went out a champion out of the camp of the Philiſtines, Goliath of Gath*, 1.Sam.17.4. with a proud challenge, and bold defiance; *Am not I a Philiſtine, and you ſervants of Saul?* Then he articleth, *Chooſe you a man for you, and let him come down to me. If he be able to fight with me, and to kill me; then we will be your ſervants: but if I prevail, and kill him; then you ſhall be our ſervants, and ſerve us.* It ſhould ſeem, the Philiſtines referred themſelves to his ſucceſſe; for when David had undertaken the duel, and *when the Philiſtines ſaw their champion dead*, (they fought not a ſtroke) *they fled. And the men of Iſrael and of Judah purſued, wounded, and killed them*, verſ. 51, 52.

Yea, in our own countrey, if upon impoſed crimes by an appellant, the defendant ſhall yeeld, or be overcome in battell, [b] *He ſhall be put to death with a grievous or more grievous pain, according to the qualitie of the crime, with the diſinheriting of his heirs, and loſſe of all his goods.* Furthermore, though he were ſlain, yet *the formality of the Common-law proceeding, adjudgeth him to capitall puniſhment, that thereby his poſterity may ſuffer the grievous concomitancy of his deſerved infamy*, ſaith that moſt learned M. Selden, my moſt courte-

[b] *Ultimo ſupplicio punietur, cum pœna gravi vel graviori, ſecundum criminis qualitatem, cum exhæredatione hæredum ſuorum, & omnium bonorum amiſſione.*

ous

ous and loving friend, in his *Duello*, or *Single Combat*, pag. 30.

5. But let us come from the ſword, where things are cut out with more rigour, if not crueltie, unto matters Eccleſiaſticall, and ſo more civil and peaceable. Did not S. Peter ſtand in ſtead of all the Apoſtles, when Chriſt ſaid to him, Joh. 21. 15,16. *Feed my lambes, --Feed my ſheep.* And again, *Feed my ſheep*, verſ. 17. Likewiſe when Chriſt ſaid to him, Matth. 16. 19. *I will give unto thee the keyes of heaven: and whatſoever thou ſhalt binde on earth, ſhall be bound in heaven: whatſoever thou ſhalt looſe on earth, ſhall be looſed in heaven.* And when this promiſe to Peter was promiſed to the reſt of the Apoſtles alſo, Matth. 18. 18. and when both theſe promiſes were fulfilled and accompliſhed, as they were after Chriſts reſurrection (and not before) and authoritie given, and by a ſolemne ceremony exhibited by Chriſt, not onely to S. Peter, but to all and every of the Apoſtles, ſaying, Joh. 20. 21,&c. *As my Father hath ſent me, even ſo ſend I you. And when he had ſaid this, he breathed on them, and ſaith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghoſt. Whoſe ſoever ſinnes ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whoſe ſoever ſinnes ye retain, they are retained.* Did not the Apoſtles repreſent the whole body of the Miniſtery? unleſſe you will fable, that in the Apoſtles dayes they had more need of remiſſion of ſinnes, then we have now; or that Chriſt loveth not his Church now, nor affordeth the like means of pardon and reconciliation, as he did in thoſe times. But by the ſame deceitfulneſſe of cavillation, you may ſay as well, that when Chriſt brake bread, and gave it to his Diſciples, and ſaid, *Take, eat; this is my body: and gave the cup to them, ſaying, Drink ye all of it*; none but they might eat, or drink the Supper of the Lord. But it is undeniable, that when Chriſt ſaid to his twelve Apoſtles, Luk. 22. 19. *This is my body which is given for you: Do this in remembrance of me*; he ſpake it to them as repreſentours of the whole Prieſthood onely: who onely have power to conſecrate the body and bloud of our Lord. Indeed Hierome ſaith, [c] *What doth a Biſhop, except Ordination, which a Prieſt doth not?* as if the Apoſtles repreſented the Biſhops in that point onley: and the Centuriatours acknowledge, that the firſt Biſhops, after the Apoſtles, were made Biſhops by the Apoſtles: and they ſay no more then is confirmed, 1. Timothy 5. 22. and Titus 1. 5. Act. 20. 28. But other Fathers extend the compariſon between the Apoſtles and Biſhops to other matters; appropriating to the Biſhops, above the Presbyters, the power of Confirmation, and divers other things. All which though we grant, yet no man will deny but for preaching, baptizing, and eſpecially for conſecrating of the Euchariſt, and Sacerdotall Abſolution, or Miniſteriall Remiſſion of ſinnes, the Apoſtles repreſented not the people

[c] *Quid facit Epiſcopus, excepta Ordinatione, quod Preſbyter non facit* Epiſt. 85. ad Euag.

in any wiſe, nor the Biſhops onely; but the univerſall body of Chriſts Miniſters.

And do not, among us, the Right Reverend Arch-biſhops, and Biſhops, and the Clergy, aſſembled in the Convocation, repreſent the whole Church of England? are not they our Nationall Councel? do not their Articles of Religion binde in conſcience all and every one of the Church of England, as much, if not more then Civill laws? Nor is there the like humane authority on earth, for the ſetling of our conſciences in matters of Scripture, or Scriptures controverted, or to be controverted, as the externall publick breathing voice of a true Oecumenical Councel of the Patriarchs, Biſhops, and choice Divines of the Chriſtian world. The eſſentiall, univerſall Church of Chriſt is (and we muſt beleeve it is) *the houſe of God, the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth*, 1. Tim. 3.15. It never erred, it cannot erre, its iudgement is infallible. *The Spirit leadeth* this Church *into all truth*, Joh. 16. 13. Of the Church of God, conſiſting of the faithfull in any one age or time, I dare ſay, it never did erre damnably, or perſiſted in ſmaller errours obſtinately; but alwayes ſome truly maintained things neceſſary to ſalvation: and unto this fluctuant militant part of the Church, Chriſt hath promiſed to be with it *to the end of the world*, Matt. 28.20. The whole viſible Church at no time can fall into hereſie; but ſome ſeek after the truth, and embrace it, and profeſſe it. Subject it is to neſciency of ſome things, and perhaps to ſome kinde of ignorance; but it cannot erre in things neceſſary, nor in leſſe matters, ſchiſmatically, with obdurate pertinacy.

Of the repreſentative Church of Chriſt in Councels, this may be ſaid truly and ſafely: viz.

Of the firſt ſix Generall Oecumenicall Councels, not one, *de facto*, erred in any definition of matters of faith. Of other lawfull general Councels, that may hereafter be called, though I will not deny but they may poſſibly be deceived, as they are men, and therefore are not free from errability: (but if ſuch Councels may erre, or pronounce amiſſe, cannot coblers?) yet there is leaſt likelihood of their erring. Such Oecumenical Councels have the ſupremeſt, publick, externall, definitive judgement in matters of Religion; if any oppoſe them, they may not onely ſilence them, but cenſure them with great cenſures, and reduce them into order. Private ſpirits muſt ſit down and reſt in their determinations, elſe do the Councels loſe *operam & oleum*. What S. Ambroſe, Epiſt. 32. ſaid of one general Councell, [d] *I follow the deciſion of the Nicene Councel, from which neither death nor ſword ſhall be able to ſeparate me*: I ſay of all true and generall Councels, and of the major part of them, who binde the reſt: without which iſſue, the gathering of Councels,

yea

[d] *Sequor tractatum Nicæni Concilii, à quo me nec mors, nec gladius poterit ſeparare.*

yea and of Parliaments alſo, would be ridiculous. For though it were a true and juſt complaint of *Andreas Duditius; Quinqueccleſienſis Epiſcopus, That in the Conventicle of Trent, the voices were rather numbred then well weighed:* yet he doth not, he cannot finde fault with that courſe, in a juſt and lawfull Generall Councel: but directeth his complaint againſt the tyrannicall power of the Pope, who made unlearned men Biſhops, as many as ſerved his turn; and more would have made, if more need had been: Biſhops [e] *pompaticall, and onely for ſhew* (as Lampridius ſaid of Perſeus his ſouldiers;) namely, titular Biſhops, void of learning, void of Churches, void of good conſciences, and mercenary paraſites.

[e] Pompaticos & oſtenſionales.

Concerning our Nationall Church, till a lawfull General Councel may be celebrated, both Paſtours and people of England are to obey her Decrees, Injunctions, Articles, Homilies, and our approved, laſt, beſt Tranſlation; above Coverdales, Tindals, or any private ones. Therefore, *Obey them that have the rule over you, and ſubmit your ſelves: for they watch for your ſouls, as they that muſt give account*, Heb. 13. 17. *And you are to follow their faith*, ver. 7.

6. The Devil brought not a more dangerous Paradox into the Church of God this thouſand yeares, then this, That every one, illiterate man or woman, at their pleaſure may judge of Scripture, and interpret Scripture, and beleeve their own fancies of the Scripture, which they call *the evidence of the Spirit:* and the contradicting them, (though with truth) they eſteem as *the not convincing*, nor *clearing of their conſcience*. So that Nationall Councels are of no eſteem, Generall Councels not of much: the ſheep will not heare the Paſtours voice; but to their pleaſure cenſure them: for, *All may erre*. The Spirit from heaven (as they ſuppoſe) doth as well dictate the ſenſe to them, as it did ſometimes the words to the holy Pen-men thereof. Let ſuch ſeduced ones know, They have the cart without the horſes and horſemen: whereas the Prophet Eliah was called (and other Church-governours may be called) *the chariot of Iſrael, and the horſemen thereof*, 2. Kings 2. 12. They have the words with the Eunuch; but want both Philip to be their guide, and the humblenes of the Eunuch, who was willing to be inſtructed, Act. 8. 30. Though they have the letter, yet they may miſſe the true literall ſenſe; which is not in divers places to be meaſured by the propriety of the words onely, or principally; as in proverbiall, parabolicall, and myſterious ſentences. The literal ſenſe is the hardeſt to finde. [f] *They that follow the bare letter, do kill the Sonne of God, who is wholly perceived in the Spirit*, ſaith Hierome of ſome men, on Matt. 26. 21. Preſumptuous and illiterate Expoſitours are like the Carriers or Poſts, haſting between Princes; having letters of

[f] *Simplicem ſequentes literam occidunt Filium Dei, qui totus ſentitur in Spiritu.*

truth in their packets, but ſealed up, ſo that they cannot ſee nor know them; while their mouthes are full of leaſings, falſe rumours, and lies. They have the ſpirit of ſelf-conceit and pride. Theſe men little think, that they who *wreſted ſome hard places in S. Paul, as they did alſo the other Scriptures*, wreſted them *to their own deſtruction*, 2. Pet. 3. 16. What ſhall become of thoſe, who wreſt eaſie places? Theſe dream not, that [g] *it belongs almoſt to the ſame authority, to interpret, and to make:* That they are to reſt on the Generall Commiſſion given to the Prieſt, *Teach all nations:* (therefore others muſt learn:) That the Prieſts lips muſt preſerve knowledge, and the people muſt fetch the Law from their mouth: That an implicite belief in depths beyond their capacity, is better then adventurous daring to take from the holy word of God that divine ſenſe which it hath, and to faſten their own falſe ſenſe upon it. Tertullian ſaith, [h] *The truth of the Scripture may be depraved as well by a falſe gloſſe, as by corrupting the text.* Hierome thus, [i] *The Goſpel is not in the words, but in the ſenſe; not in the outſide, but in the marrow; not in the leaves of ſpeeches, but in the root of reaſon.* Irenæus 2.25. [k] *It is better for the ignorant to continue in the love of God, which quickneth a man, and to ſeek no other knowledge but Jeſus Chriſt the Sonne of God crucified for us, then by ſubtilties of queſtions and much talking to fall into impieties.* And Auguſtine, *Serm.* 20. *de verbis Apoſt.* [l] *A faithfull ignorance is better then a raſh knowledge.* Again, S. Hierome *ad Demetriadem*, ſpeaketh of unlearned men, [m] *Knowing not how to ſpeak, they cannot hold their peace, but will needs teach the Scriptures which they underſtand not, and be maſters of the ignorant, before they be diſciples of the learned. It is good to obey our elders, to ſubmit to thoſe that are ſet over us, and next to the rules of the Scriptures, to learn of others how to live, and not to be led by our own preſumption, the worſt guide of all others.* Excellent is the counſel of Gregory Nazianzen to theſe fanaticall giddy-brain'd private ſpirits, *Ye ſheep, preſume not to lead your Paſtours, &c.* If a Jew, a Turk, a Devil convince thy conſcience, thou muſt follow it: ſhall the governour of thy ſoul have no other power over thee, then Jew, Turk, or Devil? Or was the Miniſtery ordained in vain? In vain indeed it was ordained, if every one be his own judge, or a peremptory judge of his guide. If great learned men may be deceived; may not the ignorant man much more? I dare truely avouch, that the unlearned, ſingle-languaged-interpreting-lay-man, hath all the faults whatſoever learned men have, and ſome other; eſpecially ſuch as are the offſprings of ignorance. That wiſe Hiſtorian Philip *de Commines*, in his 3. book 4. chap. reckoneth it as an unſeemly thing to reaſon of Divinity before a Doctour. The world is turned topſi-turvey: the great and moſt learned Arch-

g *Ejuſdem penè autoritatis eſt interpretari, cujus condere.*

h *Tantum veritati obſtrepit adulter ſenſus, quantum corruptor ſtylus.* De Præſcript. adverſ. hæret. cap. 17. & 38.

i *Non eſt in verbis Evangelium, ſed in ſenſu; non in ſuperficie, ſed in medulla; non in ſermonum foliis, ſed in radice rationis.* Comment. in Galat. 1.

k *Melius eſt, nihil omnino ſcientem perſeverare in dilectione Dei, quæ hominem vivificat, nec aliud inquirere ad ſcientiam, niſi Jeſum Chriſtum Filium Dei, pro nobis crucifixum, quàm per quæſtionum ſubtilitates, & multiloquium, in impietates cadere.*

l *Melior eſt fidelis ignorantia, quàm temeraria ſcientia.*

m *Quum loqui neſciunt, tacere non poſſunt, docéntq; Scripturas quas non intelligunt; priùs imperitorum magiſtri, quàm doctorum diſcipuli. Bonum eſt obedire majoribus, parere præfectis, & poſt regulas Scripturarum vitæ ſuæ tramitem ab aliis diſcere, nec præceptore uti peſſimo, ſcilicet præſumptione ſuâ.*

Archbiſhop of Canterbury was confronted by a cobler; yea *confounded*, if we will beleeve that monſter of men, that incarnate devill, Martin Marre-Prelate, who thus ſung of his Idol,

Who made the godly Cobler Cliff
For to confound his Grace?

I warrant you, the ſpirit, the private ſpirit, by which the fool preſumed that he was guided. Sleidan, *Comment.* 22. *fol.* 266. ſaith it was one of Charles the fifth his Edicts, [n] *Let no man take upon him to diſpute publickly or privately of the ſacred Scripture, eſpecially of doubtfull and hard points; or to interpret it; except he be a Divine that hath the teſtimonie of ſome approved Univerſitie.* It was an holy Edict, breeding reverence to the ſacred word of God, and I could wiſh it were in practiſe with us; though I muſt needs confeſſe, the breach of the edict was too ſeverely puniſhed: for the men were to be beheaded, and the women to be buried alive, though they deſiſted from their errour; but if they were obſtinate, they were to be burned, and their goods confiſcated. Yet the rebellions of the Anabaptiſts in Germanie may be ſome cloke for that cruell ſentence; which rebellions alſo (forſooth) were moved by the Spirit of God; if, for example ſake, you wil give credit to Thom. Muncer his oration unto the armed rebellious clowns: [o] *We are ſure* (ſaith he) *that I began not this action by any private authoritie of mine, but by a divine injunction, &c.* And again, [p] *Ye your ſelves ſhall ſee the manifeſt help of God.* And he had Scripture to confirm it; Scripture in word, not in ſenſe; Scripture miſapplied, things falling out contrary to his propheticall Spirit: for they were overcome, and he beheaded. Likewiſe Sleiden, *Comment.* 30. *fol.* 28. ſaith of the Anabaptiſts, [q] *They ſaid they had conference with God, and a mandate from him, to kill all the wicked, and then to frame a new world, wherein none but the godly and innocent ſhould live.* This I will ſay of mine own knowledge, that when that man of happy memory, the late right Reverend, now moſt bleſſed Saint, Arthur Lake, Lord Biſhop of Bath and Wells, appointed Doctour Sclater (now alſo a Saint of heaven, then my moſt learned loving friend, and ſometime fellow-Collegian in the two royall Colledges at Eaton and Cambridge) with my ſelf, to conferre with an Anabaptiſticall woman; we heard her determine great depths of Divinitie as confidently as ever S. Paul did, though he was taught by Chriſt himſelf; and as nimbly as ever an ape crackt nuts: yet ſo ignorantly, and with ſuch *non-ſenſe*, that we both wondred at her incredible boldneſſe. The Revelation ſhe had at her fingers ends: ſhe thought that ſhe underſtood it better then S. John himſelf; and defined in a few houres conference more depths of Divinitie, then ſix Generall Councels would in a long time. Myſteries were no myſteries to her:

[n] *Nè quis de Sacra Scriptura, maximè de rebus dubiis & difficilibus, privatim aut publicè diſputet, aut ejus interpretationem ſibi ſumat, niſi ſit Theologus, qui probatæ alicujus Academiæ teſtimonium habeat.*

[o] *Conſtat nobis, auſpicatum eſſe me hanc actionem, non meâ quadam autoritate privatâ, ſed juſſu divino.*

[p] *Videbitis ipſi manifeſtum Dei auxilium.*

[q] *Cum Deo colloquium ſibi eſſe, & mandatum ſe habere aiebant, ut impiis omnibus interfectis, novum conſtituerent mundum, in quo pii ſolùm & innocentes viverent.*

if an Angel of earth, or one from heaven inſtruct her contrary to her frantick prepoſſeſt imagination, ſhe would conclude, *Becauſe the Spirit bloweth where it liſteth, that the Spirit inſtructed her in the right way.* A fit conſequence for ſuch a *pſeudo-prophetiſſa.*

7. But what do I ſpeak of her ſelf-conceit, when of late an other of her ſex hath printed a book of her phantaſticall crudities, and by Engliſh anagrams expoundeth Scripture? A new kinde of interpretation never thought of, fit for a woman to be the inventour of. She teacheth Daniel to reveal himſelf after a new faſhion: and ſuch things, which, were he alive and racked, he muſt ſay he never thought of. She thinks ſhe untieth knots, and gives light to propheſies; but indeed miſapplieth things paſt, and perhaps future contingents, to preſent times: and while ſhe gathereth many excellent ſtrains of words and ſentences out of the divine Writ, in coupling them together ſhe maketh ſuch a roaring hotch-potch, as if ſhe had vowed to write full-mouthed *non-ſenſe* in loftie terms; others not knowing, nor perhaps herſelf, what ſhe aimeth at. Take a taſte of her anagrams.

DANIEL. I END AL.

Yet did not he end all propheſies, nor all things.

MEDES AND PERSIANS.

SEND MEE SPANIARDS.

What would ſhe do with them? It was feared that they would have come too ſoon for her and others too.

THE ROUGH GOATE.

THE GOTH ROAGUE.

Like you this? you ſhall have more as bad, as void of wit.

PRINCE OF PERSIA.

I CAN POPE FRIERS.

If Friers ſhould come, and prevail, they would teach her to be more humble.

DARIUS THE MED.

I DREAMED THUS.

Awake dreamer: no ſenſe is in thy dreams, much leſſe religion. Was ever Scripture made ſuch *a noſe of wax?* did ever any religious heart think, ſuch could be the meaning of thoſe words? Let me but touch at her obſcene expoſition of the end of Chriſts Circumciſion, pag. 5; and conſider her fanaticall imagination, that the Spirit of God by Michael underſtood King James, pag. 50: And the warre in heaven with Michael and his Angels, againſt the Dragon and his Angels, is thus expounded by her, pag. 55. *The fray is fought by ſeconds: by Michael is meant King James; the Dragon is the Pope, whom Michael overcame by the bloud of the Lambe, and by the teſtimonie of ſo many Biſhops, and other faithfull, crowned with the glory of Martyr-*

Martyrdome: whereas King James had never a Biſhop ſo crowned, and never a Biſhop was ſo crowned ſince he was born. Holy, peaceable, and harmleſſe King James, who would ſcarce hurt a worm, is now interpreted to be the greateſt fighter among the celeſtiall hoſt.

I could wiſh ſhe would repent for her blaſphemy, pag. 70, where ſhe writeth, *That the perſon of the ſonne of God* (not made) *was turned into a lump of clay:* and for her pointing out the day of judgement. For though ſhe confeſſeth, pag. 90, *Of the day & houre no man knoweth, no not the Angels that are in heaven, nor the Sonne, but the Father*; yet ſhe addeth, *The account of this book of note is by centuries of yeares.* Suppoſe it were ſo, (as it is not) could not Chriſt and his Angels know the day by the computation of centuries, as well as ſhe? but ſhe, by a new account, hath found out (as ſhe imagineth) what Chriſt and the good Angels were ignorant of, namely, the exact day of doom. For thus ſhe determineth, pag. 100, *There is nineteen yeares and a half to the day of judgement, July the twenty eighth one thouſand ſix hundred twenty five.* Had not this woman been better never to have ſeen Scripture, then thus to profane it, and take Gods word in vain? You think you have the Spirit of God, as you write in the laſt page: but I am ſure, if you repent not betimes, for your wire-drawing of Gods word, and intruding into hidden and unſearchable depths of Divinitie; you are in a deſperate caſe, and all the Separatiſts and Enthuſiaſts of the Nether-lands, where they ſay your book was printed, cannot defend you. Let the women rather go to their needle, and their ſpindle. *Let the woman learn in ſilence with all ſubjection*, 1. Tim. 2. 11. *But I ſuffer not a woman to teach, nor to uſurp authority over the man,* (as ſhe doth, if ſhe turn expoſitrix) *but to be in ſilence*, ſaith S. Paul.

Quis expedivit pſittaco ſuum χαῖρε,
Picáſque docuit noſtra verba conari?

Cornelius Cornelii à Lapide deſerveth the ſevereſt cenſure of the Inquiſition, for expounding the word of God by an Hebrew anagram, on Exod. 25.18; though he cite a piece of Scripture for a parallell. Indeed S. Hierome on thoſe words, *Sheſhach ſhall drink after them*, Jeremie 25. 26, interprets it to be *Babel:* becauſe, if you mingle in the Hebrew Alphabet the firſt letter with the laſt, the ſecond with the laſt ſave one, and ſo forth, till you come to the middle, and invert the order of reading, which we do for the memory of children: as for example א ת, ב ש; when you are come to the middeſt ל and כ do meet: then that which in the ordinary and forward reading is *Babel*, in the inverted reading is *Sheſhach*. I apprehend him thus: write in one line the Hebrew Alphabet, beginning with א, and ending with ת; in another line begin with

ת

ל, and end with ת: what in the right way is *Babel*, in the froward way is *Sheſhach*. For ב the ſecond letter being doubled, and ל the twelfth letter in their proper places and rank, make with their vowels, *Babel*; and ש the ſecond letter being alſo doubled with כ the twelfth letter in the alphabet, in the prepoſterous poſture of them, with the ſame vowels, do make *Sheſhach*; & therefore *Babel* is called *Sheſhach*. *Magno conatu, meras nugas: Great ado about meer trifles.* Indeed the Rabbines have many mutuall oppoſitions of letters in the inverted alphabet, and none ſo ancient as this, as Bertram in his *Comparatio Grammaticæ Hebraicæ & Aramicæ* truly obſerveth; and of the Cabaliſticall interchangeing of letters, he preferreth this *Athbaſch* above all: yet is it more nice and curious, then ſound or religious; neither can S. Hieroms authority give authority or allowance to this mingle-mangle-kinde of interpretation: his authority in this point being weakened by his ſlender conjecture. *I think* (ſaith he) *that the Prophet Jeremy did prudently conceal the name of Babel, leſt the beſiegers of Jeruſalem ſhould be enraged againſt him*: but (ſay I) otherwhere he nameth *Babel*, as Jeremy 50. 18. and layeth a burden upon the kingdome and citie of Babylon, upon her Princes and her wiſe men, both in the 50 and 51 chapters. Yea in the ſame 25 chapter, ver. 12, Jeremy ſaith from God, *I will puniſh the king of Babylon, and that nation.* Which inconvenience Lyra foreſeeing, therefore, perhaps, the rather thinketh, that *Sheſhach* is the name of the Egyptian King, and that *Pharaoh* was the common name; as afterward *Ceſar* was the common name of the Emperours, and *Julius* a proper name. This is evident, there was a *Sheſhach*, king of Egypt in the dayes of Solomon, 1. King. 11. 40. and there might alſo be a ſecond *Sheſhach* after. But Lyra himſelf on Jer. 51. 41. ſaith, that *Sheſhach* in that place is uſed for *Babel*; and I am forced to ſay, that no part of the 51 chap. toucheth on the woes of Egypt, but purpoſely is bent againſt Babylon; and it is not likely that the ſame Prophet would call two diſtinct kings, or two diſtinct kingdomes by the ſame word *Sheſhach*. Therefore Lyra is out of tune in this ſtrain. But why then is *Sheſhach* put for *Babel*? If no reaſon could be aſſigned, yet the word of God is not ſo to be dandled withall, or rather to be tortured, as to draw expoſitions out of anagrams; and therefore the Jeſuit was juſtly blameable, to make this place a pattern of his anagrammatiſticall interpretation. Mr. Selden *de Dis Syris, Syntagm. 2. Cap. 12.* ſaith, *Sheſhach may ſeem to be an idol of the Babylonians, a ſhe-idol, or perhaps* (as it is in his *Addenda*) *a maſculine Deity:* but he leaveth all to conjecture; wherein though he hath done excellently, yet I rather follow in this point Tremellius, who on Jeremy 25. 26. obſerveth, that *Sheſhach* in the Babyloniſh tongue doth ſignifie *Diem feſtum celebrans,*

brans, and ſo may ſignifie, either *the King*, or *the City*, *keeping a feſtivall day*: Which was never without feaſting. Now that both the feaſt was kept, and the feſtivall day deſigned to the worſhip of their idols, may be judged by the event, Daniel 5. 4. where *they praiſed the gods*; and for ſo doing was Belſhazzar reprehended, verſ. 23. Tremellius addeth, that Jeremy by this one word did demonſtrate with his finger the very day of the King of Babel, and Babylons fall; as if he had ſaid, *At a feaſt he ſhall be ſlain*, or, *In her feaſting the city ſhall be deſtroyed*. For as the Lord propheſied by Iſaiah, *Prepare the table, watch in the watch-tower, eat, drink*, Iſa. 21. 5. where both the feaſt, and the fall of the King of Babel, and of the city alſo is divinely foretold: ſo God gave a ſecond warning, Jeremy 51. 39. *In their heat I will make their feaſts, and I will make them drunken, that they may rejoyce, & ſleep a perpetuall ſleep*. Where Babylons feaſting-deſtruction is named; then followeth, *I will bring them down like lambes to the ſlaughter*, ver. 40. whereupon he crieth out in the 41. ver. *How is Sheſhach taken?* that is, *Diem feſtum celebrans*, either *the feaſting Belſhazzar*, or, *the feaſting city overthrown?* Concerning the King, the Scripture ſaith, Daniel 5. 1. *He made a great feaſt to a thouſand of his lords, and drank wine; and whiles he taſted the wine, he commanded to bring the golden and ſilver veſſels of the temple of Jeruſalem; and in the ſame houre the fingers of a mans hand wrote his deſtruction; and that night was he* (the wine-bibbing Sheſhach) *ſlain*. Concerning the city, I proved before out of Jeremy, that her deſtruction was to wait upon her intemperance; and ſo, *Quomodo capta eſt Sheſhach, id eſt, Civitas diem feſtum celebrans?* And indeed I rather incline to this latter expoſition, in this place, becauſe alſo of the words immediately following, *How is the praiſe of the whole earth ſurpriſed?* (but neither Belſhazzar, nor Sheſhach, if it were an idol, were the praiſe of the whole earth) *How is Babylon become an aſtoniſhment among the nations?* If you judge it to be a ſhe-idol, becauſe it is ſaid, *Quomodo capta eſt Sheſhach?* I firſt anſwer, that at that feaſt ſervice was done to many idols of gold and ſilver, braſſe and iron, wood and ſtone, Daniel 5. 23. but that Sheſhach was the chief among them, or that any one idol of them was ſo named, is yet to be proved. Therefore the other anſwer may ſtand good, that there is no neceſſitie of making the word *Sheſhach* to be the proper name of King, City, or Idol: it may rather be an appellative. For Jeremy 25. 26. *Rex Sheſhach bibet poſt eos*: which (as I ſaid) you may interpret, *Rex diem feſtum celebrans bibet poſt eos, The King celebrating a feſtivall day, ſhall drink after them*; though Tremell. hath it thus, *Rex Babyloniæ feſta habentis bibet, &c.* I cannot deny, but if there were ſuch an idol among them as was termed *Sheſhach*, (which is our main

enqui-

enquiry, yet unproved) it might, as well as *Bel*, *Merodach*, and *Melcom*, ſignifie the people which worſhipped it. Till that point be evidenced, I will ſay with Tremellius, that the forbearing to name the King, or veiling the name of the city, and deſcribing him or it by what was propheſied they ſhould be doing or acting, (as indeed it fell out) is to be referred *ad* [r] *σεμνότητα orationis, to the gravitie and weight of the ſpeech:* wherein the Scripture keepeth its majeſtie; and neither with bitter invective, nor harſh exprobration, but with compoſed gravitie, and eloquent ſolemnitie deſigneth the King or Babylon out, not expreſſely, by his or her name; but by their actions: as Nabals name was applied by his own wife, to ſignifie his churliſh nature, 1. Sam. 25. 25. *Nabal is his name, and folly is with him:* and Jeruſalem is called *the holy city*, for the holy things there done, there contained. I conclude thus, If anagrammes from the Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriack, or Greek, languages in which the words of holy Scripture were writ, may not be admitted (as indeed they may not;) much leſſe may we expound the ſacred Originall by Engliſh anagrammes, the flaſhes and fire-works of luxuriant brains.

[r] De qua Hermog. Tom. 4. de inventione.

Hearty reverence, and a kinde of ceremonious civill adoration beſeemeth the word of God. It is not much prating, or pridy-ſelf-love, that makes the good expoſitour. *The ſilence of ſwannes is not overcome by the noiſe of ſwallows; but when the ſwallows are grown hoarſe, the ſwannes ſhall ſing*, ſaith Nazianzen. The application is eaſy. Joſephus, in his ſecond book againſt Apion, ſaith of the Jewiſh high prieſt, *He ſhall judge of doubtfull matters, and puniſh thoſe that are convinced by the law. Whoſoever obeyeth not him, ſhall undergo puniſhment, as he that behaves himſelf impiouſly againſt God.* The great, dubious, perplexed ſcruples & difficulties were not left to the judicature of private fancies. *Artificum eſt judicare de arte, It belongs to artificers to judge of the art*, is a maxime of infallible truth. Hierome upon theſe words, Eccles. 3. 7. *A time to keep ſilence, and a time to ſpeak*, thus; [s] *We learn no art without a teacher; onely this is ſo mean and ſo eaſie, that it needeth no teacher:* and he ſpeaketh by Ironie of thoſe who are rath-ripe in religion. Ariſtotle Ethic. 1. *Every one judgeth aright of thoſe things which he knows; and this is a good judge.* And this is called by Ockam our countryman, [t] *the judgement of certain and veridicall knowledge.* Luther divinely, [u] *It is not lawfull for Angels, much leſſe for men, to interpret Gods words as they liſt:* much leſſe for women, ſay I. Tertullian in his time ſtyled them *hereticall women*, that dared to teach, and contend in argument: and nothing truer then this, that [x] *Ignorance breeds confidence, learning fear and diſtruſt. Who is more bold then blinde bayard? To the word of God we muſt adde nothing contrarie or forein*, ſaith Aquin. *No propheſie of the Scripture is of any private interpretation,*

2. Pet.

[s] *Omnes artes abſq; doctore non diſcimus; ſola hæc tam vilis & facilis eſt, ut non indigeat præceptore.*

[t] *Judicium certæ & veridicæ cognitionis.*

[u] *Non licet Angelis, nedum hominibus, verba Dei pro arbitrio interpretari.*

[x] *Imperitia confidentiam, eruditio timorem creat.*

2. Pet. 1. 20. *Know this first,* ſaith the Apoſtle there. Or is Daniel no Prophet, and his writing not propheticall? If the wit of men, or Angels from heaven, ſhould make a law, a written law, by which people ſhould be ruled or judged, (as for example, concerning theevery) and appoint no living judge to determine who offend againſt the law, and who are puniſhable or not puniſhable; but leave every one to judge himſelf by this written law, and every one to interpret the law to his pleaſure: were it not a fooliſh law, a mock-law, and indeed a no-law? And ſhall God give us a law concerning our ſouls, and permit the interpretation of it to every one? The living judge, in matters of Faith and Religion, in every Kingdome of Chriſtian government, is the Nationall Councel thereof, till there be found that *panchreſtum medicamentum, that medicine good for all diſeaſes,* for the Univerſall Church of Chriſt, a true and free generall Councel; from which is no appeal, it being the ſupremeſt externall judge on earth.

Yea, but the Bereans *received the word with all readines of minde, and ſearched the Scriptures daily, whether thoſe things were ſo,* Acts 17.11. Shall they examine the very Apoſtles doctrine, and not we the doctrine of our Paſtours? I anſwer, firſt, Theſe Bereans were learned and eminent men. But every unlearned skullion now, that hath skill onely in the Engliſh originall, will conteſt with the profoundeſt Clerks. Secondly, theſe Bereans were unbeleevers before the examination of thoſe things: for immediately it followeth, *Therefore many of them beleeved, and many honourable Greek women and men.* Art thou an unbeleever? Do thou then as thoſe unbeleevers did. If thou beleeveſt, ſhew me one paſſage of Scripture, where ever the unlearned people did call the doctrine of their learned Paſtours into triall.

I confeſſe, that the judgement of the Scripture and Creed is onely authentick, and perfectly deciſive. And if we could exactly hit on the true meaning, all differences were quickly at an end. Nor do I monopolize learning to the Clergy, when I confine and reſtrain the judgement of learning to the learned. Many there are among the people, who in all literature, humane and divine, exceed many Prieſts: and I wiſh they were more in number, and that way more abundantly qualified. With the Churchmen it would be better, ſince [y] *Learning hath no enemy but the ignorant.* There are ſonnes of wiſdome, and ſonnes of knowledge. As *Wiſdome is juſtified of her children,* Matth. 11. 19. ſo learning is not to be judged by the unlearned, but by her children.

I acknowledge, that all and every one of the people are to anſwer for their thoughts, words, and deeds; and that God hath given them a judgement of diſcretion in things which they know: but in matters above their knowledge,

[y] *Scientia neminem habet inimicum, præter ignorantem.*

and tranſcending their capacitie, they have neither judgement to diſcern, nor diſcretion to judge. *Nè ſutor ultra crepidam.* Shall blinde men judge of colours? *Sus Minervam? Phormio Hannibalem? Aſinus ad lyram?* **He that learns muſt beleeve*, ſaith Ariſtotle.

* Δεῖ τὸν μανθάνοντα πιστεύειν.

I abhorre that monſtrous opinion of Tolet and others in the Papacy, *That it is meritorious in ſimple men to be miſled by their Paſtours.* And yet all truth is not at all times to be publiſhed to all alike. Chriſt forbad the Apoſtles to reveal the truth to the Gentiles and Samaritanes, (who were then in an indiſpoſition to beleeve) Matth. 10.5. *Give not* τὸ ἅγιον, *that which is holy unto dogs, and caſt not* τοὺς μαργαρίτας ὑμῶν, *your pearls before ſwine*, Matth. 7. 6. By which τὸ ἅγιον and μαργαρίτας, *he meaneth the Goſpel*, ſaith S. Auguſtine, *De adulterinis conjugiis* 1. 27. Again, Matth. 16. 20, our Saviour *charged his Diſciples that they ſhould tell no man that he was Jeſus the Chriſt:* (namely for ſome time) which yet himſelf publiſhed, as he ſaw occaſion, John 5. 18. and 10. 30. and 18. 37. and died for the publiſhing of it, ſealing the truth with his bloud, Mark 14.62. 1.Tim. 6. 13. Yea, Chriſt himſelf concealed divers things from his own Apoſtles, and from ſome Apoſtles more then from others. Peter, James, and John did ſee more then the reſt of the Apoſtles, and were commanded to conceal the Tranſfiguration, even from the reſt of the Apoſtles. *Tell the viſion to no man, untill the Sonne of man be riſen again from the dead*, ſaith Chriſt to them, Matth. 17. 9. and yet the knowledge of the Tranſfiguration was none of the neceſſary points to ſalvation. Chriſt at firſt taught obſcurely as it were by ſhadows and reſemblances: both his death by the amphibolous words, *Deſtroy this Temple*, Joh. 2. 19. and his reſurrection and aſcenſion, by inſtancing in the type of the braſen ſerpent lifted up, Joh. 3. 14. For Chriſt was lifted up or exalted; both by men (Ὅταν ὑψώσητε, *When you have lift up the Sonne of man*, Joh. 8. 28.) and *by the right hand of God*, τῇ δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑψωθείς, Acts 2. 33. Yea, God ὑπερύψωσε, *ſuperexaltavit eum, highly exalted him*, Philip. 2.9. After, he ſpake more plainly, *and he began to teach* his Apoſtles of his ſufferings and reſurrection, Mark 8. 31. and that *openly*, ver. 32. which is confirmed by ſpecializing of the time, Matth. 16. 21. Ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο, *From that time forth began Jeſus* δεικνύειν, *to demonſtrate:* inſomuch that his Diſciples ſaid unto him, *Lo, now thou ſpeakeſt plainly, and ſpeakeſt no proverb*, or *parable*, Joh. 16.29. And the Apoſtle, 1.Cor. 3.1,2. acknowledgeth, that he *fed them with milk*, becauſe *they were not able to bear* ſtrong *meat:* inſomuch that *he could not ſpeak unto them as unto ſpirituall, but as unto carnall, as unto babes in Chriſt. Could not*, that is, could not conveniently, could not to their good or edification. *A young man is not a fit hearer of morall Philoſophie*, ſaith Ariſtotle.

Briefly

Briefly thus, All religions under heaven, the true and the falsely called religion, have had their *arcana, their secrets and mysteries*, the patefaction whereof was not promiscuously imparted to every one of the vulgar or illiterate sort: who sometimes hit upon a good belief, and by it may *rapere cœlum, take heaven by force* (in the phrase and sentence of S. Augustine) *whiles learned men may be thrust to hell*; but indeed know little with the perfection of knowledge. It must be confessed, that it was the accursed policie of our adversaries, to nuzle up the people in ignorance: but *Buy the Bible*, saith S. Chrysostom; *Search the Scriptures*, saith Christ, John 5.39. Let all the people daily reade or heare them, meditate on them, and labour to follow them: let them who have any learning interpret them according to the competency of their gifts, and in their own families instruct the more unlearned. What said King Henry the eighth, Decemb. 24. in the 37 yeare of his reigne? (as it is in Stows Chronicle, enlarged by Howes, pag. 590) and to whom said he it? *Be not judges your selves of your own phantasticall opinions, and vain expositions: For in such high causes you may lightly erre. And though you be permitted to reade holy Scriptures, and to have the word of God in your mother-tongue; you must understand, it is licensed you so to do, onely to inform your consciences, and to instruct your children and families; and not to dispute, and make Scripture a railing and a taunting stock against Priests and Preachers, as many light people do.*

Queen Elisabeth also shewed her dislike in Parliament, March 29. in the 27 yeare of her reigne (in Stows Chronicle, pag. 702) saying, *I see many overbold with God Almighty; making too many subtile scannings of his blessed will; as Lawyers do with humane testaments. The presumption is so great, that I may not suffer it, — nor tolerate new-fangledneſſe.* So she. Humilitie, and subjection of spirit ought to be in every Prophet to the Prophets: and shall the unlearned take up presumption as a buckler? and arm himself with obstinate singularity, (which is a branch of pride) as with a sword? As I would not have the people, with the Papists, as it were, to hoodwink and cover their eyes, that they may be led by others; and glory in blinde obedience, which little differeth from wilfull, and stupid ignorance; but advise them to unmuffle their heads, and open their own eyes, and judge of things which they do or can know, & are skilfull to judge: (but [z] *Ignorance in a Judge is as bad as injustice*, and a simple unlearned Judge is a mischief, as intolerable, as unheard of) so do I wish the people, to avoid the other extream of Separatists; who thinking they know all things, though they have no heavenly inspiration, will seem wiser then their teachers; and taking up opinions for truth, and malepert obstinacy for humble constancy, disrepute their Pastours, disregard all authority, and ascribe nothing to that sovereigne generall commission, *He who heareth*

[z] *Ignorantia in Judice æquiparatur dolo.*

heareth you, heareth me: which is enough to ſeal up their mouthes and captive their thoughts unto their learned Paſtours, in things which themſelves cannot apprehend, and their Paſtours can well judge of.

Oh but men are men; and as men, may erre. I hope, the unlearned people are not Angels, nor more free from errour then the learned. Yet we muſt be led by our conſciences. True; and your conſciences even therefore ought the rather to be well grounded, and founded; not upon the ſlippery ſand of ſelf-conceit, but on knowledge, as on a ſure and ſafe rock. And in whom ſhould knowledge reſide, if not in your Paſtours?

But in Queen Maries daies ſhould a man have been led by his Paſtours, when themſelves were at ods, and the greateſt part awry? Or how ſhould a true Proteſtant, and now a ſubject of Spain, in Spain behave himſelf? How much is left to his power of diſcretion, when the whole Eſtate, both Eccleſiaſtick and Civil, runneth with a torrent the contrary way? If he be led by his conſcience, and oppoſe them; there followeth (with the hideous, ſecret, moſt feared, and affrighting torments of the Inquiſition) confiſcation of goods, and ſometimes ſhamefull, commonly a painfull and violent death. If he rely on the advice of the Paſtours, he ſinneth againſt his own conſcience, and againſt truth. Who can, or will direct this wavering Chriſtian, in ſuch uncertainty of wayes, that he ſtep not aſide, nor be out of the right path?

O gracious God, *ſend out thy light and thy truth; let them lead me,* Pſal. 43.3. Let them direct my diſcourſe, and illuminate it; that it may be to the anxious and ſcrupulous conſcience as a guide, to direct the way; and as a lanthorn, to give it light in the way.

S. Hierome and Ockam, and Doctour Field, (of the Church 4.13.) three moſt eminent in three ages (a Father, a Schoolman, and a pillar of our Church) do counſel good men, in ſuch a caſe, to ſilence and mourning in ſecret, as the Prophet Jeremy did: *Men* (ſaith he) *have nothing left unto them, but with ſorrowfull hearts to referre all unto God.* I ſhould rather, under correction, ſay, That a Chriſtian thus perplexed is to take theſe courſes, which thoſe Divines, perhaps, did preſuppoſe as neceſſary preparatives, but did not expreſſe.

Firſt, I adviſe that man, whoſe conſcience runneth a ſingular way, *to waſh his heart from wickedneſſe,* Jerem. 4. 14. *to lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godlineſſe and honeſty:* which is pointed at, as a means whereby men may come to the knowledge of the truth, 1. Tim. 2.2.&c. For *unto the wicked God ſaith, What haſt thou to do to declare my ſtatutes, or that thou ſhouldeſt take my covenant in thy mouth?* Pſal. 50. 16. Ezek. 20. 3. Yes, but *thou art confident that thou thy ſelf art a guide of the blinde, a light of them*

which

which are in darkneſſe, an inſtructer of the fooliſh, a teacher of babes, having the form of knowledge and of the truth in the Law, Rom. 2. 10. I anſwer, Thou muſt alſo take the qualifications and neceſſary appendants to a reformer, following in that place immediately: *Thou therefore that teacheſt an other, teacheſt thou not thy ſelf? &c.* Thy ſelf muſt not be ignorant, thy ſelf muſt not ſteal, not commit adultery, not commit ſacriledge, not break the Law, not diſhonour God. For, as it is Wiſd. 1. 5, 6. *The holy ſpirit of diſcipline will flee deceit, and remove from thoughts that are without underſtanding, and will not abide where unrighteouſneſſe cometh in. For wiſdome is a loving ſpirit.* Never were the uncharitable, ignorant, or ſinnefull men, fit undertakers to contradict eſtabliſhed doctrines, diſciplines, or commonwealths. But, *Thou hypocrite, firſt caſt out the beam out of thine own eye; and then ſhalt thou ſee clearly to caſt out the mote out of thy brothers eye*, Matth. 7. 5. Reaſons more then ordinary will be expected by God and good men from him who leapeth out of the Church in which he was born and bred, kicking at the breaſts of his mother, running with the bit in his teeth his own wayes. I conclude this firſt point thus; *He who will needs runne ſuch ſingular courſes, had need be a man of rare ſanctity, and of ſingular good endowments of knowledge.*

Secondly, I would have him earneſtly to pray for humility, and to practiſe it. By pride Satan caſt himſelf out of heaven; Adam him and his out of Paradiſe. David ſaid, Pſal. 131. 1. *Lord, my heart is not haughty, — neither do I exerciſe my ſelf in great matters, or in things too high for me.* And verſ. 2. *Surely I have quieted my ſoul as a childe that is weaned of his mother: my ſoul is even as a weaned childe.* On which words, ſuffer me to make a little excurſion, by way of explanation.

Concerning the firſt paſſage: If David had appealed to men, ſome ſcruple might have remained: but ſaying to God the ſearcher of hearts and reins, *Lord, my heart is not haughty*; he maketh his humility unqueſtionable.

In the ſecond paſſage, obſerve, that though he was a King and a Prophet; yet ſome things were too high for him, by his own confeſſion. Nazianzen περὶ ἑυταξίας pag. 153. *Him I count humble, not that ſpeaks humbly and modeſtly of himſelf, or that ſpeaks courteouſly and humbly to his inferiour, but that ſpeaks modeſtly concerning God, and knows what to ſpeak and what to conceal, and in ſome things can confeſſe his ignorance, and yeeld to them to whom the office of teaching is committed.* On the contrary, [a] *The object of a proud man is himſelf*, and he is *higher in his own conceit then is fit*, ſaith Cajetan. Pride exalteth a man, humilitie caſts him down: and as all pride ſhall be at the laſt thrown down; ſo all true humilitie ſhall be exalted. I would not go to heaven by pride: no man ever went to hell by humilitie.

In the third paſſage, this is the ſenſe: May my hopes, or God himſelf

[a] *Objectum ſuperbi eſt ipſemet, celſior quàm ei convenit.*

heareth you, heareth me: which is enough to ſeal up their mouthes and captive their thoughts unto their learned Paſtours, in things which themſelves cannot apprehend, and their Paſtours can well judge of.

Oh but men are men; and as men, may erre. I hope, the unlearned people are not Angels, nor more free from errour then the learned. Yet we muſt be led by our conſciences. True; and your conſciences even therefore ought the rather to be well grounded, and founded; not upon the ſlippery ſand of ſelf-conceit, but on knowledge, as on a ſure and ſafe rock. And in whom ſhould knowledge reſide, if not in your Paſtours?

But in Queen Maries daies ſhould a man have been led by his Paſtours, when themſelves were at ods, and the greateſt part awry? Or how ſhould a true Proteſtant, and now a ſubject of Spain, in Spain behave himſelf? How much is left to his power of diſcretion, when the whole Eſtate, both Eccleſiaſtick and Civil, runneth with a torrent the contrary way? If he be led by his conſcience, and oppoſe them; there followeth (with the hideous, ſecret, moſt feared, and affrighting torments of the Inquiſition) confiſcation of goods, and ſometimes ſhamefull, commonly a painfull and violent death. If he rely on the advice of the Paſtours, he ſinneth againſt his own conſcience, and againſt truth. Who can, or will direct this wavering Chriſtian, in ſuch uncertainty of wayes, that he ſtep not aſide, nor be out of the right path?

O gracious God, *ſend out thy light and thy truth; let them lead me,* Pſal. 43.3. Let them direct my diſcourſe, and illuminate it; that it may be to the anxious and ſcrupulous conſcience as a guide, to direct the way; and as a lanthorn, to give it light in the way.

S. Hierome and Ockam, and Doctour Field, (of the Church 4.13.) three moſt eminent in three ages (a Father, a Schoolman, and a pillar of our Church) do counſel good men, in ſuch a caſe, to ſilence and mourning in ſecret, as the Prophet Jeremy did: *Men* (ſaith he) *have nothing left unto them, but with ſorrowfull hearts to referre all unto God.* I ſhould rather, under correction, ſay, That a Chriſtian thus perplexed is to take theſe courſes, which thoſe Divines, perhaps, did preſuppoſe as neceſſary preparatives, but did not expreſſe.

Firſt, I adviſe that man, whoſe conſcience runneth a ſingular way, *to waſh his heart from wickedneſſe,* Jerem. 4.14. *to lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godlineſſe and honeſty:* which is pointed at, as a means whereby men may come to the knowledge of the truth, 1. Tim. 2.2. &c. For *unto the wicked God ſaith, What haſt thou to do to declare my ſtatutes, or that thou ſhouldeſt take my covenant in thy mouth?* Pſal. 50.16. Ezek. 20.3. Yes, but *thou art confident that thou thy ſelf art a guide of the blinde, a light of them*

which

which are in darkneſſe, an inſtructer of the fooliſh, a teacher of babes, having the form of knowledge and of the truth in the Law, Rom. 2. 10. I anſwer, Thou muſt alſo take the qualifications and neceſſary appendants to a reformer, following in that place immediately: *Thou therefore that teacheſt an other, teacheſt thou not thy ſelf? &c.* Thy ſelf muſt not be ignorant, thy ſelf muſt not ſteal, not commit adultery, not commit ſacriledge, not break the Law, not diſhonour God. For, as it is Wiſd. 1. 5, 6. *The holy ſpirit of diſcipline will flee deceit, and remove from thoughts that are without underſtanding, and will not abide where unrighteouſneſſe cometh in. For wiſdome is a loving ſpirit.* Never were the uncharitable, ignorant, or ſinnefull men, fit undertakers to contradict eſtabliſhed doctrines, diſciplines, or commonwealths. But, *Thou hypocrite, firſt caſt out the beam out of thine own eye; and then ſhalt thou ſee clearly to caſt out the mote out of thy brothers eye,* Matth. 7. 5. Reaſons more then ordinary will be expected by God and good men from him who leapeth out of the Church in which he was born and bred, kicking at the breaſts of his mother, running with the bit in his teeth his own wayes. I conclude this firſt point thus; *He who will needs runne ſuch ſingular courſes, had need be a man of rare ſanctity, and of ſingular good endowments of knowledge.*

Secondly, I would have him earneſtly to pray for humility, and to practiſe it. By pride Satan caſt himſelf out of heaven; Adam him and his out of Paradiſe. David ſaid, Pſal. 131. 1. *Lord, my heart is not haughty, — neither do I exerciſe my ſelf in great matters, or in things too high for me.* And verſ. 2. *Surely I have quieted my ſoul as a childe that is weaned of his mother: my ſoul is even as a weaned childe.* On which words, ſuffer me to make a little excurſion, by way of explanation.

Concerning the firſt paſſage: If David had appealed to men, ſome ſcruple might have remained: but ſaying to God the ſearcher of hearts and reins, *Lord, my heart is not haughty*; he maketh his humility unqueſtionable.

In the ſecond paſſage, obſerve, that though he was a King and a Prophet; yet ſome things were too high for him, by his own confeſſion. Nazianzen περὶ ἑυταξίας pag. 153. *Him I count humble, not that ſpeaks humbly and modeſtly of himſelf, or that ſpeaks courteouſly and humbly to his inferiour, but that ſpeaks modeſtly concerning God, and knows what to ſpeak and what to conceal, and in ſome things can confeſſe his ignorance, and yeeld to them to whom the office of teaching is committed.* On the contrary, [a] *The object of a proud man is himſelf,* and he is *higher in his own conceit then is fit,* ſaith Cajetan. Pride exalteth a man, humilitie caſts him down: and as all pride ſhall be at the laſt thrown down; ſo all true humilitie ſhall be exalted. I would not go to heaven by pride: no man ever went to hell by humilitie.

[a] *Objectum ſuperbi eſt ipſemet, celſior quàm ei conveniat.*

In the third paſſage, this is the ſenſe: May my hopes, or God

himſelf fail me, may evil betide me, (for this, or ſome ſuch like imprecation antecedent is to be underſtood) *ſi non poſui & ſilere feci animam meam,* as it runneth in the Hebrew. The oath it ſelf, or imprecation is not expreſſed, that people may learn to be abſtemious in ſwearing. In which regard alſo it is ſaid, Ecclus 23. 10. ὁ ὀμνύων καὶ ὀνομάζων, *Jurans & nominans; He that ſweareth and nameth God:* Where the Vulgat and Septuagint omit the name of God; though it be neceſſarily underſtood, and is expreſſed in our beſt tranſlation.

In the laſt paſſage, remember that we ought all, in this point of humilitie, to be *as little children*, if we will *enter into the kingdome of heaven,* Matth. 18. 3. David addeth, *My ſoul is as a weaned childe:* not in this reſpect, that newly weaned children are commonly more froward: (ſimilitudes hold not in every particular) but as the mother applieth muſtard, wormwood, and other bitter things, to her breaſts, that ſhe may keep her childe from the milk which he deſireth; though ſhe know it inconvenient, or hurtfull for him: ſo God did wean David, by the bitter remembrances of death, fear of Gods judgement, and the pains of hell; and by croſſes alſo of this life, ſickneſſe, baniſhment, envy in court, inſurrection of his own ſonnes, and the like, from thoſe pleaſurable things which David affected, but God knew to be naught for him. There was never any archheretick, or grand impoſtour, but made private ends his cynoſure, ſelf-conceit and ſelf-love his card and compaſſe.

Even after God had wondrouſly appeared unto Moſes, and gave him his miſſion, Moſes replied, Exod. 3. 11. *Who am I, that I ſhould go unto Pharaoh? &c.* and Exod. 4. 1, 2. his backwardneſſe further appeareth: yea, after, though God by his two miracles confirmed the calling, yet twice more did he declare, that he was afraid to begin ſo great an alteration, Exod. 4. 10. and eſpecially at the 13. verſ. inſomuch that the Lord was angry. Humbleneſſe, which is alwayes accompanied with modeſty, baſhfulneſſe, meaſuring ones own ſtrength, and ſubjection of ſpirit, is to be prayed for, and practiſed by any ſcrupulous Chriſtian, before he make himſelf a formall partie of oppoſition or contradiction.

The third requiſite followeth; That this holy and humbled man conferre with more learned men, and ſpecially with his Paſtour. If his Paſtour give him not ſufficient ſatisfaction, let him conferre with other Divines. Yea, if he be a Paſtour himſelf, yet let him take heed of ſingularitie, the daughter of pride: and let him not lightly or ſleightly eſteem of their judgements, who more abound in knowledge, or to whom a direction of ſouls is by God himſelf more eſpecially committed; who are, in matters above his capacitie, his proper judges; and he is in ſuch things, to ſubject himſelf unto them. I doubt not, but,

if

if his ſuperiours ſhould miſlead him in things ſurmounting his knowledge and capacitie, his humble, conformable obedience, and deſires are better accepted of God, then another man, who without knowledge or any true ground ſtumbleth on a truth, grows talkative and preſumptuous, though he be ready to die for that truth. Above all things, let him not apply himſelf to ſuch men alone, as he knoweth to be addicted to his own way; nor come with prejudice to heare the contrary part: but ſince he will not reſt in other mens determinations, he, who will be an upright judge, ought indifferently to heare both cauſes pleaded; and, after all good and neceſſary procedure unto true judicature, to judge with right judgement. This is a rock, upon which many ſplit themſelves; who pretend to ſeek out the truth, but go onely to ſuch as they know beforehand do run with a byas to their humour, and will animate them in their ſingularitie: and thereby, in ſtead of inſtruction, are flattered in their folly, and ſoothed in their erroneous conceits. [b] *He that determineth any thing before he hath heard both parties; though he give juſt judgement, he is not a juſt judge.* And again I ſay, [c] *Ignorance in a judge is as bad as injuſtice.*

When this godly man is humbled, when this humble man hath conferred with his own Paſtour, and other learned men and Miniſters, and impartially heard both ſides; and ſtill reſts unſatisfied from others, and his conſcience ſtill ſettled, that he hath the truth; I wiſh him, not blindely to give over himſelf to others; but, keeping the ſtaffe of direction, and the exerciſe of his judgement of diſcretion, (for things within his verge, or reach) and following the wayes of his own conſcience, in the fourth place, I would counſel him to remove into other parts. So Elijah fled from Jezebel; yet poured out his complaints to God, 1. King. 19. 3, 10, 14. So our Saviour, when the Jews would have ſtoned him, *hid himſelf*, John 8. 59. And he directed his Apoſtles *to flee from one citie to another*, Matth. 10. 23. S. Paul *through a window was let down in a basket by a wall, and eſcaped*, 2. Cor. 11. 33. and God himſelf *hid Baruch and Jeremy*, Jer. 36. 26. Thus many, both learned and unlearned, did in Queen Maries dayes; and God hath given a great bleſſing oftimes to this courſe. So S. Cyprian fled at the firſt; and then, during his voluntarie exile, wrote diverſe excellent matters, and yet afterwards died a glorious Martyr.

In the fifth place, if the good Chriſtian will not, or cannot flee, I would now commend unto him ſilence and mourning, as the Prophet Jeremy did; which S. Hierom, Ockam, and Doctour Field preſcribe as the onely means. Let him worſhip God in private, as Daniel did *three times a day, and prayed*, Daniel 6. 10. for God *will regard the prayer of the deſtitute, &c. This ſhall be written for the generation to come*, as it is Pſal. 102 17, 18. which

[b] *Qui ſtatuit aliquid parte inauditâ alterâ; Æquum licèt ſtatuerit, haud æquus fuit.*

[c] *Ignorantia in Judice æquiparatur dolo.*

Pſalme is *a prayer for the afflicted when he is overwhelmed, and poureth out his complaint before the Lord*: for this is the very ſuperſcription of that Pſalme. The Prophets *dayes conſumed like ſmoke, and his bones burnt as an hearth*, verſ. 3. His *heart was ſmitten and withered*, verſ. 4. and *by reaſon of the voice of his groaning, his bones did cleave to his skin*, verſ. 5. He was *a pelican of the wildernesſe, and like an owl of the deſert*, verſ. 6. *like a ſparrow alone upon the houſe top*, verſ. 7. whiles *his enemies reproached him, and were mad againſt him, and ſworn againſt him, he ate aſhes like bread, and mingled his drink with weeping*, ver. 8, 9. The Lamentations of Jeremy would fit his mouth, and the dolefull complaints in divers Pſalmes would well accord with them. But above all, he ſhould call to minde, That there was no ſorrow like Chriſts ſorrow: That he alone trod out the wine-preſſe of Gods wrath: That he was reviled, ſpit upon, buffetted, whipped, crucified; & that deſpiteous piercing rent his very dead body. Let him ſolace his ſoul with ſpirituall comforts, and make melody to God in his heart; loſing himſelf in ſpeculation of Chriſts infinite merit, and applying to his own ſoul all heavenly joy. Let him withdraw himſelf from being ſeen in publick: let him embrace privacy and retiredneſſe; living (if it were poſſible) under Jonas his gourd, or in vaults, whoſe darkneſſe and blackneſſe he expelleth by internall illumination, and ſpirituall irradiation. The Baptiſt; and our bleſſed Saviour himſelf, betook themſelves to deſerts and mountains for their ſolitary devotions, when errour and unrighteouſneſſe ſat in the chair of Moſes. Thus the perſecuted holy ones of the Primitive Church ſerved God, at the buriall of their dead, *by nightly ſongs*, ſaith [d] Nazianzen; reſiding ſometimes *in cryptis*, in caves and grots under ground, in dens, among the rocks. But ſuppoſe he be drawn forth, and cannot lie hid; ſuppoſe the Magiſtrate ſummon him to his tribunall, and examine him very ſtrictly: how then ought this man to behave himſelf? Firſt, I would have him to abhorre all mentall reſervations. If he uſe ambiguity of word, phraſe, or ſentence, (which was the guiſe of the myſterious, enigmaticall oracles) if by an Apoſiopeſis, Irony, or any Rhetoricall figure allowed in art, practiſed among men, and conceiveable by an intelligent auditour, he excuſe, qualifie, and keep ſecret his own actions or other mens counſels; I will not wholly blame him: [e] *No man is bound to bewray himſelf: every one is tied to defend himſelf.* A traitour may without ſinne plead, *Not guilty*; that is, *not proved guilty* at your barre; where [f] *Every one is preſuppoſed to be good, till he is proved to be bad. I am not guilty, ſo farre, as I am bound to accuſe my ſelf.* And this is the allowed generall acceptation of that uſance. Within the veil of ambiguous words there lieth a ſecret, ſecond, homogeneall good ſenſe; perhaps hid from ſome ſimple ones, yet diſcernable by quick, piercing, and deep apprehenſions; a ſenſe

[d] Orat. 2. in Julian.

[e] *Nemo tenetur prodere ſeipſum: quiſq; tenetur defendere ſeipſum.*

[f] *Unuſquiſq; præſupponitur eſſe bonus, donec probetur eſſe malus.*

ſenſe couſin-germane in the ſecond degree to the words; a ſenſe involved, implicit, having traces and footſteps of reaſon; hard, yet inveſtigable. *Fuga in perſecutione* is allowed; this *ſubterfugium verborum* is but a branch of it. I will not condemn David for acting the part of a frantick man, to eſcape: *He changed his behaviour before them, and feigned himſelf mad in their hands, and ſcrabled on the doores of the gate, and let his ſpittle fall down upon his beard*, 1. Sam. 21. 13. Neither will I wholly diſlike a verball equivocation; while the ſenſe is tranſparent to the wiſe or learned, though veiled to the ignorant. Philip Cominæus, 4. 11. reporteth, that when the Conſtable of France, Earl of S. Paul, had played fouly and falſly on all ſides; King Lewis the eleventh ſaid thus unto Rapine, a truſtie ſervant of the Conſtable, *I am buſied with divers affairs of great importance, and had need of ſuch an head as thy maſters is.* The ſervant interpreted all comfortably, to the better ſenſe; but the King ſaid ſoftly to the Engliſh men and the Lord of Contay, *I mean not, that we ſhould have the bodie, but the head without the bodie.* This manner of amphibolous ſpeech our Saviour uſed, when he ſaid, *Deſtroy this temple*; which they underſtood of the temple builded with ſtones: *but he ſpake of the temple of his bodie*, John 2. 19, 20, 21. And in the eighth of John, Chriſt more then once made uſe of that homonymous verball equivocation.

But let him flee, as from a ſerpent, ſo from the deluſions of the ſerpent; who of late hath taught his locuſts to make an anſwer conſiſting, part in words expreſſed and intelligible, part of thoughts reſerved and unintelligible: the ſpeakers minde feigning, framing, and new-coyning a wilde ſenſe, which had no correſpondence with the words at all. So that, for example, if the Devil ſhould ask of a Jeſuite, *Wilt thou give me thy ſoul?* the Jeſuite may (by their doctrine) ſafely and ſoundly anſwer him, *I will give thee my ſoul:* provided alwayes, that he keep in the hollow of his heart this mentall reſervation, *If thou be God Almighty.* Thus the Jeſuite thinks, that he can cozen the Devil himſelf, becauſe indeed he is not able to finde out that unexpreſſed thought of the Jeſuites heart. Yet the Angel of darkneſſe perhaps laugheth, perhaps wondereth to ſee himſelf outgone in his own wilineſſe and depths, by his own children; though time will declare the truth, that by ſuch ſubtilties they undermine, and blow up, as with gun-powder, their own, and their adherents ſalvations.

I conclude the point: I will not condemn the man, who handſomely and artfully, without lying or mentall reſervation unconceiveable, can ſhift off danger and trouble from himſelf or his friends; but he condemneth himſelf, who uſeth ſuch double diſſimulation, ſuch *leger du cœur:* who plougheth with an ox and an aſſe; making up a mixt, linſy-woolſy propoſition, of words

words ſenſible and thoughts heterogeneall and incomprehenſible: incomprehenſible (I ſay) by any power or powers created; ſince the thoughts ſtrangely vary from the words, lurking in the vaults of the heart, and can not be fiſhed or hooked out from antecedents, or conſequents, or any other circumſtances.

But, if he be put to his oath, what ſhall he do? If the matter concern not his life, let him anſwer exactly. Biſhop Andrews ſeems to diſlike, *That a man ſhould be ſworn againſt his own life*; becauſe the Prophet, by Gods direction, made that particular exception, Jeremy 38. 15. and for other reaſons by that moſt Reverend Prelat mentioned, pag. 95. in his *Opuſcula*. Yet my opinion is, *If the life of Kings or Princes, or if the welfare of the Commonwealth be in danger, or any extraordinary miſchief be like to enſue,* (which was not the caſe of Jeremy; a Prophet, no traitour; an holy man, no plotter, contriver, or partaker with wicked ones) *a man may lawfully, by the Magiſtrate, be put to his oath, though it coſt him his life; or to the rack and torture.* Unuſuall harms muſt have unuſuall remedies. The particular nature will deſtroy it ſelf, to uphold the univerſall. Rather then there ſhall be a *vacuum*, fire will deſcend. [g] *Where ſinnes runne headlong, it is not fit that juſtice ſhould be tied to go by degrees*, ſaith Seneca. If the matter concern his life, he may be ſilent, he may appeal: It is [h] Aquins judgement on a caſe not much unlike; *If a Judge ask any thing beyond what he ought in law; the accuſed is not bound to anſwer: he may appeal, or otherwiſe avoid it lawfully; but he may not lie.* And again, [i] *It is one thing to conceal a truth, another thing to propound a falſhood. It is lawfull to conceal a truth in ſome caſes (as when a man is not bound to anſwer, and when he is not bound to confeſſe it) [k] by any convenient means: Yet a man may not either ſay an untruth, or conceal a truth which he is bound to confeſſe:* [l] *Neither is it lawfull to uſe any fraud or deceit; becauſe fraud and deceit are equivalent to a lie.* But may not one equivocate when he is put unto his oath? I anſwer, That not ſo much as verball equivocation, much leſſe that lately invented and curſed *Chimæra* of mentall reſervation, is to be allowed. [m] *Deceit doth not excuſe, but aggravate perjurie*, ſaid Cicero long ſince. [n] Iſidore thus, *With what art of words ſoever a man ſwears; yet God, the Judge of conſcience, ſo eſteemeth it, as he to whom the oath is made doth underſtand it.* S. Hierome on Ezekiel 17.19. thus, [o] *It is an opinion of the world, that it matters not, whether a man overcome his enemie by guile or by valour.* But this himſelf reſolveth; [p] *As long as thou doſt not ſwear, and enter into a covenant, uſing Gods name; it is wiſdome and valour either to deceive or overcome thy adverſarie any way thou canſt: but when thou haſt bound thy ſelf with an oath, then he is no longer thine adverſarie, but thy friend, who hath truſted thee, and is deceived through*

[g] *Ubi ſcelera per abruptum eunt,* (*per prærupia*, in the African phraſe of Tertullian) *iniquum eſt juſtitiam ad gradus teneri.*

[h] 2. 2. quæſt. 69. art. 1. in corpore artic.

[i] Art. 2. in corpore.

[k] *Per aliquos convenientes modos.*

[l] *Neque etiam licet aliquam fraudem vel dolum adhibere, quia fraus & dolus vim mendacii habent.*

[m] *Fraus non diſſolvit, ſed diſtringit perjurium.*

[n] De ſummo Bono 2. 13.

[o] *Sententia ſecularis eſt, —Dolus, an virtus, quis in hoſte requirat?*

[p] *Quamdiu non jures, & pactum non ineas ſub nomine Domini; prudentiæ eſt & fortitudinis vel decipere vel ſuperare adverſarium utcunq; poteris: cùm autem te conſtrinxeris juramento, nequaquam adverſarius, ſed amicus eſt, qui tibi credidit, & ſub occaſione juris-jurandi Dei nuncupatione deceptus eſt.*

through thy oath, and using of Gods name. A little before, on verſ. 15. [q] *He that breaketh his covenant, ſhall he eſcape unpuniſhed?* S. Hierome truely thus concludeth, [r] *Even among enemies faith is to be kept:* adding a divine caution, which compriſeth our cauſe: [ſ] *It is not to be conſidered to whom, but by whom thou haſt ſworn. For he is much more faithfull, who for the name of God beleeved thee and was deceived, then thou who didſt circumvent thine enemie (yea now thy friend) by abuſing Gods ſacred Majeſtie.* I acknowledge, that S. Hierome ſpeaketh of oaths between Kings, or ſuch as have been enemies: but the reaſons reach and extend themſelves even to the cauſes of private men. Lying, fraud, or any colluſion by mentall reſervation, or verball equivocation, is wholly to be ſecluded and abhorred, when an oath is taken: prudent ſilence, in diverſe caſes, is admitted. Yea, but if an examinate be adjured, ſhall he then be ſilent? ſtill ſilent? I anſwer, I would have him imitate our bleſſed Saviour, who ſaying nothing at divers times, *inſomuch that the governour marvelled greatly*, Matth. 27. 14. yet when the high prieſt ſaid, * *I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us, whether thou be the Chriſt the ſonne of God*; though he knew it would coſt him his life, he concealed not the truth. And in ſuch an adjuration upon Religion the examinate is bound to give an account of his faith, and to witneſſe a good confeſſion, though to the expenſe of his bloud.

[t] Tertullian ſeems to be more ſcrupulous in leſſer matters, ſaying, [u] *It is a juſt and worthy rule, that in every queſtion the anſwer ſhould be applied to the ſame ſenſe & purpoſe to which the interrogation is made. To anſwer of one thing when he is asked of another, is the part of a mad man.* Again, [x] *The ſenſe of the anſwer is not to be directed to any other thing then that which was propounded in the interrogation. So farre is that from Chriſt, which beſeems not a meer man.* So he. I anſwer, firſt, Tertullian ſpeaketh of queſtions in Divinitie, to inſtruct the ſoul: and there it were ſinne to delude the ſimple queſtioniſt. Secondly, he ſpeaketh of queſtions *extra jactum teli, cùm aries murum non percuſſerit*; of queſtions not concerning great danger, life, or limme: which doth ſomewhat vary the caſe. Thirdly, an homonymous anſwer of verball equivocation, doth both correſpond to the ſenſe of the queſtion, (which is all that Tertullian requireth) and implieth alſo a ſecond ſenſe, which may be underſtood by an intelligent hearer; which in a mentall reſervation is impoſſible to be unlocked, opened, and cleared, except by an hand divine. Fourthly, Tertullian cannot be thought to condemn verball equivocation; the daintie uſe whereof makes almoſt as great a difference between a wiſe man and an idiot, as between an idiot and a beaſt; and none but wiſe men can uſe it with comfort and delight. And the wiſer men be, as their hearts, by divers thoughts,

[q] *Qui diſſolvit pactum, numquid effugiet?*

[r] *Etiam inter hoſtes ſervanda fides eſt.*

[ſ] *Non conſiderandum cui, ſed per quem juraveris. Multò enim fidelior eſt ille, qui propter nomen Dei tibi credidit & deceptus eſt, te, qui per occaſionem divinæ Majeſtatis hoſti tuo, imò jam amico, es molitus inſidias.*

* Matth. 26. 63.

[t] Contra Marcionem lib. 4. pag. 286.

[u] *Juſta & digna præſcriptio eſt, in omni quæſtione, ad propoſitum interrogationis pertinere debere ſenſum reſponſionis. Aliud conſulenti aliud reſpondere, dementis eſt.*

[x] *Senſus reſponſionis non eſt ad aliud dirigendus quàm ad propoſitum interrogationis: quò magis abſit à Chriſto, quod nè homini quidem convenit.*

thoughts, are deeper then the fools; ſo their words are more abſtruſe, bivious, multivious. What writings under heaven, of finite men, have or can have ſuch multiplicity of meanings, as are in Scripture compriſed under the words dictated by an infinite Spirit? whoſe whole, intire, exact depths, the meer creature never knew fully and perfectly. *If I might have my deſire,* quoth S. Auguſtine, *I had rather ſpeak in words, whoſe divers ſenſes might give content to divers people of different apprehenſions, then in words that can have one ſenſe onely.*

The ſecond thing I would commend unto this examinate, is, to give faire language to his Judges. Let him not be bold and malapert, nor uſe clamorous oppoſition. Let not the ignorant Syllogize in *Barbara, Darii, Ferio*; or marre his cauſe by ill handling: yet if he be unmoveably conſtant, let him ſay, *I cannot diſpute, but I can die:* let him not provoke the Judge by words or actions ill adviſed. Eulalia, being a girle about 12 yeares old, did ſpit in the face of the Judge, that he might the rather condemn her. The anſwer of Hannah, 1. Samuel 1. 15, &c. when ſhe was in bitterneſſe of ſoul, to the miſjudgeing and uncharitably zealous Prieſt Eli, was as a ſweet incenſe in the noſtrils of God; and is a good leſſon for all to take out, when they are called before the Magiſtrates, though hard meaſure were offered. *How long wilt thou be drunken,* quoth he? *put away thy wine from thee.* And ſhe anſwered, *No, my lord, I am a woman of a ſorrowfull ſpirit; I have drunk neither wine, nor ſtrong drink, &c. Count not thine handmaid for a daughter of Belial.* The manner of anſwering may be ſinfull, though the matter be good: froward behaviour never benefitteth a cauſe, but *a gentle anſwer pacifieth wrath,* Proverbs 15. 1. Taunting recrimination argueth a diſtempered ſpirit in the gall of bitterneſſe. How humbly did our bleſſed Saviour behave himſelf under the hands of unjuſt Judges? How conſtantly, zealouſly, and boldly (becauſe they were inſpired immediately from God) did the Apoſtles, Act. 4. plead for themſelves, yet without malapertneſſe, or irreverence. S. Paul his ſpeech to the high prieſt exacteth a larger diſcourſe. Acts. 23. 5, Paul ſaid, *I knew not, brethren, that he was the high prieſt.* Some think, that S. Paul knew Ananias to be high prieſt, when he called him *painted wall.* I anſwer, (if ſo it were) this is no fit example for ſawcineſſe to be uſed, in our times, towards Magiſtrates. For, firſt, if S. Paul did know him, he might ſpeak, though not as a Prophet, yet illuminated and inſpired from God: which now is not in uſe. Secondly, he might ſpeak as a Prophet, foredivining an evil end to Ananias, *as indeed it came to paſſe,* ſaith [y] Chryſoſtom. If any one of them who now revile Magiſtracy, have the ſpirit prophetical, denouncing contingent future things, which yet end in accompliſhment; I will not call him a ſawcy preſumptuous fellow. Thirdly though

[y] Homil. 6. de Laudibus Pauli.

though divers learned men think the contrary; and that he ſpake by an Irony, when he ſaid, *I knew not:* yet I perſwade my ſelf, that S. Paul, in truth, knew not (when he ſpake) Ananias to be the high prieſt, for theſe reaſons:

Firſt, becauſe he ſeemeth to put on the ſpirit of mildneſſe towards them that ſtood by him, who were alſo the ſame παρεστῶτες, *ſtanders by*, who had ſmit and buffetted him: and calling them by the charitable term of *brethren*, whom it had been fitter to reprove; it argueth his plain ſincerity, ſpeaking of his ſuperiour.

Secondly, if S. Paul had ſpoken by way of jeſt, irriſion, or Irony, when he ſaid, *I knew not, brethren, that he was the high prieſt*; he might well have ceaſed there. But ſince he bringeth in the ſacred Text, ſeriouſly, truly, and ſadly, to confirm his neſciency; and that there is no mocking with the divine veritie; with me it ſhall paſſe currant, that he ſpake from the bottome of his heart, when he ſaid, *he knew him not to be the high prieſt*. The Spirit never taught any inſpired to apply Scripture contrary to their knowledge, nor to cite the ſacred Text of truth to prove an untruth.

Thirdly, conſider the *Antitheſis* and oppoſition between the words. In the fifth verſe he ſaid ſimply, and directly, Οὐκ ᾔδειν, *I knew not*: where his ignorance is the more ſeriouſly profeſſed by the oppoſition in the ſixth verſe, Γνοὺς δὲ ὁ Παῦλος, *But Paul knowing that the one part were Saddaces, and the other Phariſees*: as if the Spirit had ſaid, *Paul indeed was ignorant who was the high prieſt; but he knew they were divided into factions*: the word *But* running with a ſingular emphaſis to this point.

Fourthly, by this expoſition we ſhall cut off that objection, which Julian the Apoſtata uſed againſt S. Paul; as if, by this double dealing, he were a very time-ſerver in his words; we maintaining all to be done in ſolemn gravity, and reality of truth.

Fifthly, if S. Paul had ſpoken Ironically, that he had not known the high prieſt, when they knew one an other; how eaſily could the high prieſt have confuted and confounded him, and laid lying and impoſture to his charge? But this he did not do: therefore, in likelihood, S. Paul knew him not.

Laſtly, the objections for the former opinion are eaſily anſwered. How could he be ignorant, who was the high prieſt; when he was bred up in their law, and well acquainted and familiarly in their *Synedrion*, and had been there, when S. Stephen was condemned, and when he got letters from the high prieſt, a little before his converſion? eſpecially, ſince he appealeth to the high prieſt, as to his witneſſe, Acts 22. 5?

To the firſt point; I confeſſe, he was bred up in their law, and could not *then* in likelihood be ignorant who was the high

prieſt, or what was his name: yet *now* he might be ignorant; for S. Paul had been away from Jeruſalem a good while, avoiding the ſtorm of perſecution; and high prieſts died as other men: and at that time there were two high prieſts, which was not of old: and with one of them he might not be acquainted.

Oh, but he frequented the *Synedrion*. I confeſſe, that not onely *the witneſſes laid down their clothes at a young mans feet, whoſe name was Saul*, Acts 7.58. but that *Saul conſented to the death of S. Stephen*, Acts 8. 1. and as certain that he (as a principall agent) *received letters from the high prieſt, and all the eſtate of the elders*, to ſearch out the Chriſtians, and *to bring them to be puniſhed*, Acts 22. 5. and ſo he muſt needs know the high prieſt and the elders, and they him: and therefore, in likelihood, he was converſant ſometimes in their *Synedrion*. But I ſay as before, this might not be that high prieſt, who ſat to condemn S. Stephen, or to whom S. Paul appealed as witneſſe: but the other high prieſt might ſit at this time, and on this day; ſince now and then one ſat, now and then an other, and ſometimes both of them. And thus S. Paul might be ignorant, who was his Judge.

Oh, but he well knew the high prieſt by his place and by his clothes. I anſwer; The Jews were not now ſitting in their Councel-houſe, but where the chief Captain commanded them to appeare, Acts 22. 30. himſelf ſitting as the Moderatour in his own tribunall; which he was not wont to do in their *Synedrion:* neither might the high prieſt take the proper veſtments in ſuch a place, by which he might be known from others.

To cloſe up all; If nothing ſaid before do ſatisfie thee, but thou art confident, that S. Paul did know the high prieſt; (though thou wert better to adhere to the words) yet have I found out an other way for the opening of this point, which hath perplexed many learned men. Obſerve therefore, I pray thee, theſe things:

Firſt, that not onely the high prieſt, but all their Councel were ſummoned to appeare, Acts 22. 30. and of the Councel each man had liberty to ſpeak at his pleaſure: and at ſuch publick trialls there is a great dinne, murmures, and mutterings; ſo that the ſpeaker is not alwaies diſcernable, whiles many may ſpeak at once, and ſome louder then others.

Secondly, while *S. Paul earneſtly beheld*, not the high prieſt onely, but *the Councel*, Acts 23.1. (caſting his eyes from one to another) *the high prieſt commanded him to be ſmitten on the mouth.* Theſe words S. Paul might heare: and yet not know, in ſuch a confuſed noiſe, which of thoſe his many Judges ſpake them: and in likelihood thought, that ſuch an unjuſt ſentence could not proceed out of the high prieſts mouth: but to the authour

of

of thoſe words, whoſoever he was, to that unjuſt Judge S. Paul ſharply and punctually replied, *God will judge thee, thou painted wall.* But when S. Paul was informed, that they were the words of the high prieſt himſelf; he was ſory for his quick ſpeech, and ſaid, *I knew not, brethren, that he was the high prieſt.* So that, if S. Paul had known the high prieſt, and the high prieſt him; if they had been well acquainted the one with the other, at this time of S. Pauls triall (which will never be ſufficiently proved;) yet here is now a new way, as probable as any, to excuſe the Apoſtle from diſſimulation, and from uſing the Scripture as a cloke to it; *viz.* Though S. Paul knew the man to be the high prieſt; yet he knew not at firſt that it was the high prieſt, who pronounced ſo unjuſt and furious a ſentence: but divers of the ſeventy two Judges might be ſpeaking one to another; and S. Paul might be miſtaken, at firſt, in the ſpeaker: As if he had ſaid, *I knew not, brethren, it was the high prieſt* that ſpake theſe words concerning me.

And thus, I hope, this difficultie is cleared. I will onely adde this, That divers ancient Fathers from S. Pauls example, in this place, prove his modeſty, moderation, and undiſturbed paſſions, by his ſudden, wiſe, ſetled anſwers: And, That I hold this paraphraſe probable, as if S. Paul had ſaid, *If I had wiſt, that it was the high prieſt who uſed thoſe words; though I would not have forborn others, yet I would have forborn him; ſince God had ſaid,* THOU SHALT NOT SPEAK EVIL OF THE RULER OF THY PEOPLE.

But yet this man that is ſought out, and drawn into judgement, and anſwereth (as he ought to do) truly, without mentall reſervation, modeſtly, and as befitteth him to anſwer unto his ſuperiours: if he receive no ſatisfaction in his conſcience, and his Judges doom him worthy to die; what ſhall he now do? Shall he be over-ruled by his ſuperiours, both ſpirituall and temporall, doing as they do, and thinking as they think? ſhall he go againſt the dictates of his own conſcience? or ſhall he adventure his bloud and life?

What my ſelf would do, by Gods grace, I will preſcribe unto another. Firſt, before I would ſacrifice my life, I would once more recollect my former thoughts for humbleneſſe; and diligently conſider, whether the matters for which I am to ſuffer death, be abſtruſe depths, beyond my reach or capacity. If they be very intricate, I have cauſe to think, that I am an unfit man to judge of things which I know not, and cannot comprehend, 2. Cor. 10 13, &c. Secondly, I would in this caſe, before expenſe of bloud, bring my intentions to the touchſtone, call to minde, that good intentions alone cannot excuſe me before God, but good intentions well grounded and regulated. S. Paul with good intentions perſecuted the Church, and was

injurious: but he *did it ignorantly, in unbelief*, 1. Tim. 1. 13. where an ill belief, though meaning well, is counted unbelief. In a good intention S. Peter would have diſſwaded our Saviour from death, but he was called *Satan* for it, Matth. 16. 23. though Chriſt had bleſſed him before, and promiſed him excellent gifts, verſ. 17, &c. I cannot think, but they who offered their children unto Moloch, did think they ſerved God rightly, though indeed they ſerved the Devil: yet God ſaith, Levit. 20. 3. *I will ſet my face againſt that man, and will cut him off from among his people.* The prieſts of Baal, who *cut themſelves after their manner with knives, and lancers, till the bloud guſhed out upon them*, 1. King. 18. 28. did they not follow the ill guide of a miſled conſcience? did they not think they were in the right? do not millions of Turks, Jews, and of Pagans go to the Devil, though they perſwade themſelves they be in the onely true way? do not many think that to be conſtancie, which in truth is obſtinacie? and that to be knowledge, which is ignorant ſelf-love? There is great reſemblance, and manifold likelyhood between ſome truth and ſome errour, and the miſtake is eaſie; and there is a great difference between opinion and ſound belief. Thirdly, I would endeavour to think humbly of my ſelf, and, as the Apoſtle adviſeth, to preferre others before me. I would ruminate on that which the Apoſtle ſaith, 1. Cor. 13. 3. *Though I give my bodie to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing.* And, ſhewing what he meaneth by *charity*, addeth, *Charity ſuffereth long, and is kinde: charity envieth not: charity is not raſh*, or, *vaunteth not it ſelf: is not puffed up, doth not behave it ſelf unſeemly.* So that he who behaveth himſelf unſeemly, who is puffed up, who vaunteth himſelf, or is raſh, who envieth, and is unkinde, and haſty, hath not charity: And, *though he give his bodie to be burned, his death profiteth him nothing*, ſaith the Apoſtle. Examine therefore, and again I ſay, examine thine own heart: if thou finde any one of theſe ſinnes beforenamed reigning in thee, then know there is a ſpot in the ſacrifice. And till that be waſhed away, raſed out, or reformed; thou muſt ſuſpect thy ſelf, and mayeſt well be dubious. Self-conceit is a branch of pride: pride never agreed with charity: and no death profiteth a man any thing, who hath not charity.

Oh, but this enfeebleth the reſolution of confeſſours, and ſtoopeth down the conſtancy of martyrs to pendulousneſſe: it maketh them draw their hands back from the plough, and to look backward to Sodom, with lots wife. No no, my diſcourſe intends onely to dull the edge of ſingularity, to ſtop the mouths of pridie undertakers, and ignorant praters, to put a bridle into the teeth of ſuch as revile Magiſtracie, to reduce people to humbleneſſe, and ſuch thoughts as theſe, *If many may be deceived,*

how

how much easier may I? If the more learned be awrie; how shall I be sure I am right? They have souls to answer, as well as I: and charity bids me think, they would not damn their own souls by damning mine: have I alone a sound rectified conscience? Self-deniall is a better schoolmaster to true knowledge, then presumption. An acceptable martyr is a reasonable sacrifice, and an acceptable sacrifice is a reasonable martyr. A conscience not founded on good causes, not strengthened with understanding, is like a fair house built on the sands, a very apple of Sodom, *a painted sepulchre, which appeares beautifull outward, but is within full of dead mens bones, and of all uncleannesse*, Matth. 23.27. My cautions are not remoraes, of staying or withdrawing any man, so farre as his knowledge can or doth aspire unto; (for so farre I allow them a judgement of discretion) but necessary preparatives to the true, perfect, and glorious martyrdome. He shall be no martyr in my estimate, who without great motives runneth to death, and posteth rashly to destruction. But when pride with all her children, singularity, self-love, vaunting, rashnesse, unseemly behaviour, is cast out of the soul; and the contrary graces, the children of charitie, possesse it: then, if thy conscience can no way be convicted; if thou knowest thy cause to be good, and the contrary to be apparently amisse; follow not the multitude, conform not thy self to the world, keep thy conscience untainted, poure out thy bloud unto death, offer thy life and body as a reasonable sacrifice; die, and be a martyr; be a martyr, and be crowned; crowned, I say, not onely with glory and immortality, but with those gifts and *aurcolæ*, which are prepared above others for true martyrs. In this sort, *Whosoever shall confesse Christ before men, him will Christ confesse also before his Father which is in heaven*, Matth. 10.32.

The judgement of jurisdiction, which is in superiours having authoritie; and the judgement of direction, which is in Pastours by way of eminency, forbid not in this case the judgement of discretion, which is and ought to be in every private man, so farre as he hath discretion and knowledge or immediate inspirations: of all which I would not have a man too presumptuous.

That which our Divines do term *the judgement of discretion*, is, in the words of [z] Tertullian, *Clavis Agnitionis:* He must never contrary this; for this must he die. What he knoweth, let him, as a good witnesse, seal with his bloud, if need be. But in things beyond a simple mans capacitie, I will say once more, with [a] Augustine, [b] *A faithfull ignorance is better then a rash knowledge*. In such things is he to be guided by his Pastours. The easie things any man may judge of: in the more abstruse, the voice of the Pastours is to be followed. [c] *What key had the*

[z] Contra Marcionem 4. post medium pag. 269.

[a] Serm. 20. de verbis Apostoli.

[b] *Melior est fidelis ignorantia quàm temeraria scientia.*

[c] *Quam clavem habebant Legis Doctores, nisi interpretationem legis?*

Doctours of the law, (ſaith Tertullian in the ſame place) *but the interpretation of the law?* So *the key of interpretation* reſts in the miniſtery, for things which need interpretation, as hard places do; though *the key of agnition*, in things unto which their knowledge can aſpire, is permitted, yea, commended unto all men: and they who withhold this *key of knowledge* from the people, are accurſed by Chriſt, Luke 11. 52.

To the further explaining of my opinion, let us conſider, in a Church corrupted, theſe two ſorts of people. Firſt, the Magiſtrates, either Civil or Eccleſiaſticall: And we will ſubdivide them into the Wilfully blinde, and the Purblinde.

Of the firſt were ſome Biſhops, and Nobles, and Gentry in Queen Maries dayes; who hunted after bloud, even the bloud of innocents; and ſtrained their authority to the higheſt. Such is now the Inquiſition, falſly called *the holy houſe*, with all the chief officers thereof: ſuch in the dayes of Chriſt, were divers Scribes, Phariſees, Sadduces, and ſome Rulers of the people; who knowing the truth to be on Chriſts ſide, by his doing ſuch miracles as no man ever did before, did choke and ſtrangle their belief, made ſhipwrack of their conſciences, reſiſted the holy Spirit; who would *neither go into the kingdome of heaven, nor ſuffer others that* were *entering, to go in:* againſt whom Chriſt pronounced *wo* upon *wo*, Matth. 23. 13. &c. For *they took away the key of knowledge*, Luke 11. 52. and purpoſely kept the people ignorant and blinde. According to their demerits, there are reſerved for them *intima inferni*, *the depths of hell*, blackneſſe of darkneſſe, and the greateſt torments thereof, without repentance.

The next tribe, or ſort, are the purblinde Magiſtracy, either Secular, or Clergy. Such were divers in the dayes of Queen Mary; who had learning enough, to know that all went not right; yet did not vehemently oppoſe the truth, but did ſwimme with the ſtream, & made the time their ſtern; the whole Church turning and returning three or foure times in one age. Theſe were ſeduced, as well as ſeducers. Such alſo at this day are divers in the Papacy; more moderate, leſſe rigid and rigorous, concealing ſome truths they know, becauſe they have given up their hearts and beliefs to truſt in their Church, for ſuch things as they do not know; though they have means to learn, and capacitie to underſtand, if they would; and therefore are faulty. Such alſo were divers in the Jewiſh Church and State. *Ye killed the Prince of life*, ſaith S. Peter to the people, Acts 3. 15. *And now brethren, I wot that through ignorance ye did it, as did alſo your rulers.* Such were thoſe Phariſees, Matth. 15. 12. who *were offended* with Chriſt; of whom Chriſt ſaith, verſ. 14. *They be blinde leaders of the blinde. And if the blinde lead the blinde, both ſhall fall into the ditch:* [a] *Into the ditch of ſinne and hell*, ſaith Hugo Cardinalis, on the

[a] *In foveam peccati & inferni.*

the place. [e] *When the ſhepherd goes by craggie clifts, the flock muſt needs fall headlong and break their necks,* ſaith Gregory. [f] *The guides are the teachers, and the ditch is hell,* ſaith Faber Stapulenſis, on the place. So much of the purblinde Magiſtracy, Clericall or Laicall, in a corrupted Church.

[e] *Cùm paſtor per abrupta graditur, neceſſe eſt ut grex in præcipitium ducatur.*

[f] *Duces, præceptores; fovea, infernus.*

From the Magiſtrates in the firſt place, we deſcend to the people in the ſecond place, whom we alſo divide into their ſeverall ranks and files.

In the generall, they are either learned or unlearned. The learned are firſt ſuch, as go againſt their conſcience, and practiſe contrary to their knowledge and belief, ſailing with winde and tide: and becauſe they will be found fault withall by the feweſt, they will do as the moſt do. Timorous hypocrites they are; fearing perſecution, loſſe of goods, liberty, and life, more then they fear God, who is able to deſtroy both body and ſoul: for whom is kept the allotment of hypocrites; brimſtone and fire, ſtorm and tempeſt, *ignis & vermis*: this ſhall be their portion to drink, without repentance.

An other ſort of learned men profeſſing truth, there are in a corrupted Church; and each of them (forſooth) will be a reformer of the publick: theſe *deſpiſe government, are preſumptuous, ſelf-willed, they are not afraid to ſpeak evil of dignities,* 2. Pet. 2. 10. *ſpeaking evil of the things that they underſtand not,* verſ. 12. (as out of queſtion they underſtand not all things, which in their carping humour they cenſure:) people-pleaſers, ambitious of eſteem, full of words, running as much after their own will as after their conſciences, hearty enough to draw on danger, obſtinate enough to provoke death. Of theſe men, though they die for ſome truths; yet becauſe they have a mixture of many errours in their intellect, perverſeneſſe in their will, and ill grounded, ill bounded affections, wanting thoſe godly endowments of charity before ſpoken of; we may pronounce, as the Apoſtle did, *They ſhall utterly periſh in their own corruption,* 2. Pet. 2. 12. Such a fellow was he, and his like, of whom [g] M^r. Fox reporteth, that when Chriſt ſaid, *This is my body,* interpreted the words to this effect, *The word of God is to be broken, diſtributed, and eaten.* So when Chriſt ſaid, *This is my bloud:* the bleſſed words are miſſenſed; as if Chriſt had then ſaid, *The Scripture muſt be given to the people, and received by them.* By which forced expoſition, the ſeal of our redemption is troden under foot, the thrice-bleſſed ſacrament of the bodie and bloud of our Lord is utterly annihilated; whereas indeed, in the words of conſecration, there are included *verba concionatoria & prædicanda, words predicatorie and ſerving for doctrine.* I will not eſteem him as an holy perfect martyr, who dieth with ſuch crotchets in his brain, ſuch pride in his heart. Such an one was Ravaillac, who for conſcience ſake (forſooth) ſtabbed the Anointed

[g] Anno 1543.

ointed of the Lord, the Heros of our time, his naturall Soveraigne, Henry the fourth of France. He followed his conſcience; but his conſcience had ill guides. When he had outfaced tortures, and death it ſelf (though he thought that he died a martyr) if he died unrepentant, the powers of hell gat hold upon him.

Such manner of people were thoſe Jews, who in moſt deſperate faſhion ſaid, *His bloud be on us, and on our children,* Matt. 27. 25. Do you think they all were wholly ignorant? do you think, they all ſwerved againſt their conſciences? or rather, medled they not in things above their callings? were they not too preſumptuous? Thus, though they had the knowledge of ſome truths, and perhaps would have died for them; yet their zeal wanted more and better knowledge, to have rectified their conſciences: and they ſhould have called to minde the miracles of Chriſt, and born witneſſe to his innocency, rather then to ſet themſelves forward in things beyond their reach and knowledge.

[h] Lib. 8. cap. 19.

Philip de [h] Commines telleth of two Franciſcans, who offered themſelves to the fire, to prove Savanorola to be an heretick, and not to have had revelations divine: and an other Frier, a Jacobin, preſented himſelf alſo to the fire, to uphold Savanorola, though Savanorola did not then expoſe himſelf to that purgation by fire. Which intendments of theirs ſeem rather to be the fruits of evil then of Chriſtian fortitude. For, [i] *The mother of martyrdome is the Catholick faith, to which thoſe famous champions have ſubſcribed with their bloud,* ſaith Aquin, out of Maximus. But thoſe bravadoes of the Friers ſavoured of the tranſalpine and ciſalpine factions: ſome inclining to the French king, with his adherents, the other to the Pope and Venetians, and their partakers.

[i] *Mater martyri eſt fides Catholica, in qua illuſtres Athletæ ſanguine ſuo ſubſcripſerunt.*

Some drew death upon them, when they needed not, in the Primitive Church; and the holy Fathers, and Councels, have diſliked them for it. The Elibertine Councel, chap. 60. [k] *If any one break idols, and be killed in the act, we think it not fit that he be received into the number of martyrs, becauſe for his ſo doing he had neither warrant of Scripture, nor example of the Apoſtles.* The Cicumcellions thruſt themſelves into the mouth of dangers: ambitious of martyrdome to that height of infatuation, that if no body would kill them, they would murder and maſſacre themſelves.

[k] *Si quis idola fregerit, & ibidem fuerit occiſus, quia in Evangelio non eſt ſcriptum, neque invenitur ab Apoſtolis unquam factum, placuit in numerum eum non recipi martyrum.*

There were alſo certain women, who to keep their chaſtity haſtened their own deaths. *Sophconia killed her ſelf, leſt the Emperour Maximinus ſhould abuſe her,* ſaith Euſebius. Pelagia flung her ſelf headlong into a river, leſt a ſouldier ſhould violate her. Such things ought not to be done, and are ſinfull, and unlawfull to be done. And yet becauſe the Church hath accounted them

them martyrs, we muſt conclude that the Church did think, they had divine inſpirations directly animating them to that courſe, as Samſon had in the Old Teſtament. [l] *When God commands, and plainly intimates that it is his command; who can blame him that obeyeth?* ſaith [m] S. Auguſtine.

Aquinas 2. 2. Quæſt. 124. Artic. 1. in the third objection, hath theſe words, [n] *It is not commendable for a man to offer himſelf to martyrdome, but ſeems rather to be preſumptuous and dangerous.* And in the anſwer he intimateth, That a man ought not to ſeek death; and ſaith expreſly, [o] *A man ought not to give occaſion of doing unjuſtly: but if another do unjuſtly, he ought to endure it patiently.*

The third and laſt ſort of learned men, in a Church and State full of errours, are thus qualified;

They are pious towards God, charitable towards men, zealous, according to their knowledge, knowing ſo much as they can well learn, mourners for ſick and dead in Sion, ſigning their cheeks with teares for the backſliding of the people, having *cornea genua*, knees hardned like horn by their frequent bendings at prayers, that God would ſhew mercy to the miſguided; ſinging to God in their hearts when danger ſtoppeth their mouths; not petulant, or immodeſt againſt the Magiſtrates; no prompt, proterve undertakers; no railers, cenſurers, or raſh damners of others; no factioniſts, or diſturbers of Commonweals; avoiding the ſtorms of perſecution, ſo farre as conveniently and conſcionably they may; *keeping the unity of truth*, as much as is poſſible, *in the bond of peace*; thus farre flexible and pliable, that they would willingly exchange any old errour (if ſuch be ſetled in them) for apparent truth; thus farre conſtant and irremoveable, that they preferre the naked truth above their lives, and can in all humbleneſſe and patience write the confeſſion of their faith with their own bloud. Such a life may I live, ſuch a death may I die: greater glory then ſuch ſhall have, I deſire not. This is the true character of a martyr, ſo perfect as uſually fleſh and bloud affords.

The laſt point concerneth unlearned men, who live in a defiled Church. Shall theſe be ruled by their Paſtours, leaving the dictates of their own conſciences, unpractiſed, unbeleeved? I anſwer, There is not the ſimpleſt of the people, to whom I will denie a judgement of diſcretion: which he is bound to follow, even unto death, according to his conſcience. And among the unlearned, there are ſome of excellent wits, quick capacities, and ſome endowments, both of nature and grace, ſurpaſſing divers learned men. Yet let every one of theſe take this advice from me; let them learn to be *Chriſti-formes, conformable to Chriſt*, (which is a point that the godly and learned Cardinall Cuſanus often and excellently inculcateth) and let them

[l] *Cùm Deus jubet, ſeq; jubere ſine ullis ambagibus intimat; quis obedientiam in crimen vocet?*

[m] De Civit. 1.26.

[n] *Non eſt laudabile quòd aliquis martyrio ſe ingerat, ſed magis videtur eſſe præſumptuoſum & periculoſum.*

[o] *Non debet homo occaſionem dare alteri injuſtè agendi: ſed ſi alius injuſtè egerit, ipſe moderatè tolerare debet.*

them labour to be every way equall to that famous martyr, whom immediatly before I characterized and deſcribed. By how much the leſſe they have of knowledge, let them have the more of humilitie and conformableneſſe. Laſtly, let them ponder, how mercifull the Lord is to ſuch as ſinne of ignorance: and on the contrarie, that not onely divers of the unlearned, but ſuch as have had a fair competency of knowledge, have been tranſported with ſelf-love; and treading out paths of ſingularity, have runne headlong into damnation. Witneſſe divers Arians, burnt in the dayes of Queen Eliſabeth: witneſſe Hacket, ſeduced by the Devil under a ſhew of long, extemporary prayers, and extraordinary holineſſe; till at the end he grew blaſphemous, and in the heat of it died. Let him think of Sir John Oldcaſtle; who intimated, not onely a poſſibility, but a likelihood of his *riſing again the third day after his hanging and burning*, if Stows chronicles had ſufficient ground to write to that effect. If I ſhould repeat the like monſters in other Churches and Commonwealths, I might much more enlarge this diſcourſe, which is too long already. I conclude: The ſimple unlearned good man, who is bound up in invincible ignorance, and is miſled by his Paſtours, to whoſe guidance he hath ſubjected his conſcience, is leſſe ſinfull, by many degrees, then he who caſteth himſelf violently, ſingularly, and proudly, into the ſame errours, or as bad. And if it be dangerous to take from the people their diſcerning power, in any cauſe, as ſome imagine; let them ponder, whether it be not more dangerous, to let every one of them to runne looſe, like the unbridled Circumcellions, to chooſe their own wayes, (which is the guiſe of Separatiſts) and to be their own judges, and judges of whatſoever their Paſtours preach, (which is the practice of ill taught zelots in our Church) and by neceſſary conſequence, judges of things of Faith, of Controverſies, and of Scripture it ſelf: And ſo the ſupreameſt Tribunall, for interpretation of matters religious, to be the conſcience of an unlearned brain. But thou, O Man of God, flee theſe extreams; and, O bleſſed God and man, O Saviour of mankinde, Jeſu Chriſt, keep us in the mean, and bring us by holineſſe to the truth, and by thy truth unto thy glory. So be it, Lord Jeſu, ſo be it.

[p] Epiſt. 44. ad Conſtantinum.

The word of God is a ſea, ſaith [p] S. Ambroſe, *having in it deep ſenſes, and height of propheticall riddles.* But in theſe dayes of Libertiniſme the ſimpleſt preſume, they can ſound theſe deeps, and finde out the riddle, though they plow not with Samſons heifer. Hence are theſe innumerable ſprings of errours, which Luther, even in his own time, ſeeing to overflow Germany, in his firſt book againſt Zwinglius and Oecolampadius, ſaith, *If the world continue, it will be again neceſſary, by reaſon of the divers interpretations of Scripture that now are, if we will keep the unity of the faith,*

faith, that we receive the decrees of Councels, and flee to them. The place of Auguſtine is common, and in every mans mouth, [q] *I would not beleeve the Goſpel, unleſſe the authority of the Catholick Church moved me.* How ſhould we know, that ſuch and ſuch things are S[illegible]ure, and not ſuch or ſuch, but by the Church; as by the f[illegible]roductary means? or why ſhould not the unlearned p[illegible]ople as well truſt their Paſtours for the expoſition of Scripture, as they have done, and do, and muſt do for the tranſlation? For be ye not deceived, O over-inſpired brethren; neither Moſes, nor the Prophets, nor Chriſt, nor the Evangeliſts or Apoſtles ever wrote or penned your Engliſh Scripture. They wrote in Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriack, and Greek: but they were your Paſtours, who tranſlated the word of God into our mother tongue; and ſome tranſlations are more imperfect then other, and no one abſolutely perfect. And will you, ſilly ignaroes, who cannot know whether the words be true or falſe, well or ill tranſlated, be every one of you your judges of the meaning thereof, (which in deep points is harder then tranſlating) and uſurp the power of interpretation? I may take up the complaint of Michael Piccart, in his epigram before Balthaſar Bambach his tractates,

Et tractare quidem quiſnam eſt qui ſacra veretur?
Imberbes pueri jam quoque ſacra crepant.

But I am loath to adde, as he doth,

O pecus Arcadicum, linguas priùs imbibe ſanctas,
Et ſacra ex ipſo fonte deinde pete.

Yea, I have an intent to have a bout with the learned Daniel Heinſius, for maintaining in the preface to his *Ariſtarchus Sacer* upon Nonnus, *That no man can rightly interpret the Scriptures, but he that is skilled in Eaſtern languages; Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriack, and Greek both ſacred and profane, Helleniſtical and the pure,* which is all one in effect with the Jewiſh-Greek, and the Heathen-Greek. Some of his words, pag. 53. are theſe; [r] *It is very materiall to know, whether it be Hebrew or Syriack which the Helleniſt expreſſeth in Greek: alſo, whether he hath reſpect to the Hebrew Text, or to the Greek tranſlations of it. All which unleſſe the expoſitour diſtinctly conſidereth, he muſt needs loſe his labour. And we think him to be a man as of little skill, ſo of no conſcience, that dares tranſlate the Scriptures without any conſideration of theſe things.*

Both theſe were eminent profeſſours, and men ſingular among thouſands; the firſt in High-Germany, the other in the Netherlands; from whence ſome of them brag, and ſome of us rejoyce that we have received the reformation of religion. I will onely humbly propound to your religious conſiderations theſe things:

Firſt, that the difficulties of the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Aramean languages in the Old Teſtament, and of the Greek in

[q] *Ego Evangelio non crederem, niſi me Eccleſiæ Catholicæ authoritas commoveret.*

[r] *Multum refert ſcire, Hebræa Helleniſtes Græcè expreſſerit, an Syra: Hebræum item textum, an interpretationes reſpiciat Græcorum. Quæ niſi omnia diſtinguat, operam neceſſe eſt interpres ludat. Nos autem, ut exiguæ ſcientiæ, ità uullius, ut loquuntur vulgò, conſcientiæ exiſtimamus, qui tranſferre Sacra audet, nec de iſtis cogitavit.*

in the New, eſpecially where it reflecteth up to the Syriack, are above common capacities, even of the learned. I might adde, that words of divers other languages are part of the ſacred Text. The Egyptian *Abrech*, Geneſ. 41.43. the Arabick *Lehhem*, Job 6.7. and *Totaphoth*, Exod. 13.16. a compound of Egyptian and African languages, and the like. Yea one verſe, and one onely was written by Jeremy in the Chaldee language, *viz.* Jeremy 10.11. which every captive Jew was commanded to caſt in the teeth of the Babylonians. Moreover Daniel 5.25. *Mene Mene, Tekel Upharſin*, was written in the Chaldee, with the Samaritan letters: ſo that the Chaldeans themſelves could not reade their own language. I would tell you of ▭ finall being placed in the middle of a word of the Text, and of divers other difficulties, which in part I paſſe over, and in part thus contract, in the obſervations following.

Secondly, that Hebrew words without points may have foure or five ſignifications, according to the diverſity of vowels affixed to them; and have no certain meaning, but as it is guided by antecedents and conſequents. And yet you ſhall have an ignorant mechanick, or talkative woman, as confident of the Genevean Tranſlation and notes, as if God himſelf did ſpeak or write the ſame words, as he did once the law on Horeb.

Thirdly, that in the Hebrew many words are written with fewer letters, then they are pronounced.

Fourthly, that many are written with more letters, then they are pronounced.

Fifthly, that divers words are written in the ſacred Text, which are not pronounced at all, but others are read in their ſtead. [1]*There are eight words written in the Text, but not read, which the Maſora alledgeth*, Ruth 3.12.

[1] *Sunt octo voces quæ ſcriptæ ſunt in Textu, ſed non leguntur, quas adducit Maſora*, Ruth 3.12.

Sixthly, that the Jews have moſt ſeverely and ſtrictly forbidden, that any Rabbin ſhould teach Chriſtians the true ſenſe of the Talmuds; which (as they boaſt) no labour and endeavour can attain unto without ſuch a guide. Elias Levita in Maſſoreth-Hammaſſoreth, complaineth, that the Jews were wonderfully offended with him, becauſe he inſtructed Chriſtians in the Hebrew. And though ſome tax him for ſinging *placentia*, to ſooth & flatter his patron Ægidius; and call him a turn-coat, becauſe he came forth of the Jewiſh ſynagogue to pray with us in our temples: yet that odious name ought to have been ſpared, unleſſe he kept ſtill a Jewiſh heart within him; which certainly he did, if Balthaſar Bambach ſaith truly of him, [2] *He concealed the chief myſteries, and revealed nothing of their ſecrets.*

[2] *Præcipua myſteria reticuit, & nihil arcani revelavit.*

Seventhly, that many Hebrew Radixes do ſignifie not onely things wonderfully diſparat, and incompatible the one with the other (as *Sheol* ſignifieth the *grave* in ſome places, and *hell* in other places: which cauſed ſome to deny Chriſts deſcent in his humane

humane ſoul into hell) but even things clean contrary. This inſtance (as the former) ſhall be in a word generally known. Job 2.9. his wife ſaith unto him, בָּרֵךְ אֱלֹהִים, *Curſe God*; others render it, *Bleſſe God*. None hitherto hath infallibly expounded it. Yet my Laick can *ſwallow camels, & ſtrain at gnats*, that is, buildeth upon the Tranſlation made by the Miniſters, though the ground hath been ſlippery and full of ice; but will (forſooth) be judge of the meaning, when he underſtandeth not the words: as if one unskilfull in the Dutch language ſhould ſay, when he heard a German ſpeak, *I know his meaning by his gaping, or by the ſound of his words, or by the gargariſm of his throat-ſpeech.*

Though the Apoſtle ſaith, 1. Theſſal. 5.21. *Prove all things, hold faſt that which is good*; yet he ſpeaketh of the ſpirits of private men, or miſperſwaſions of the falſe Apoſtles; who preſumed very much, and knew very little. Theſe are to be tried. But concerning the decrees of the Church, the ſame Apoſtle doth not ſay, Prove them, examine them, trie them, judge them: but Acts 16.4, Paul and other Miniſters, *as they went through the cities, delivered them the decrees for to keep,* (or obſerve) *that were ordained of the Apoſtles and Elders which were at Jeruſalem. And ſo* (or by this means of keeping, or obſervation) *were the Churches eſtabliſhed in the faith, &c.* verſe 5. But (ſaith the frantick Libertine) I am a man ſpirituall: *But he that is ſpirituall judgeth all things, yet he himſelf is judged of no man*, 1. Corinth. 2.15. I anſwer, S. Paul ſpeaketh of the Apoſtles, who had the Spirit of God, verſ. 12. and ſpake in words which the holy Ghoſt taught, verſ. 13. and who might well neglect the judgement of men, 1. Corinth. 3.3. Prove thou thy Apoſtleſhip by ſuch undeniable miracles and teſtimonies, as they did; and thou ſhalt judge, and not be judged. But that every idiot ſhould claim the priviledge of an Apoſtle, is lewd divinity, or rather inſufferable pride. The Angel in the Church of Thyatira is cenſured, Revel. 2.20. *becauſe he ſuffered that woman Jezebel, which called her ſelf a Propheteſſe, to teach and ſeduce Gods ſervants.* If the profoundeſt Divines on earth, unexperienced in worldly courſes, ſhould teach the skilfulleſt tradeſmen their trades, or manufactures, and meddle in their crafts (as they call them;) would they not expoſe themſelves to laughter and mocking? is not the proverb of the world too true, *The greateſt Clerks are not the wiſeſt men, if you take them from their books?* Are there more depths in trades, then in the Word of God? Or ſhall tradeſmen, and women judge of the depths of Divinity; and the learned Divines in their own profeſſion be not beleeved, but laught at, controlled, and cenſured by the private ſpirit of unlearned people? Are not the ſpirits of the Prophets ſubject to the Prophets? Very learned men ſcarce truſt to themſelves. A Phyſician that is very ſick, ſeeks counſel of an other who is whole, and dares not truſt his own

judgement: and ſhall a ſoul ſick of ſinne, ſick of errour, ſick of ſcruples, be its own helper? ſhall it underſtand without a guide? be cleanſed of its leproſie without a Prieſt? Hierome in his Preface to the Cõmentary upon the epiſtle to the Eph. thus, *From my youth I never ceaſed to reade, or to ask of learned men what I knew not. I never was mine own Maſter, or taught my ſelf: and of late I journeyed purpoſely to Alexandria, unto Didymus, that he might ſatisfie me in all the doubts which I had found in the Scripture.* Now adayes many a one is wiſer then his Teachers; not by ſupernall illumination, but by infernall preſumption. And if they have gotten by rote the letter of Scripture, and can readily cite *tmemata & tmematia*, the chapter and the verſe, (though they have little more judgement then Cardinall Aſcanius his parret, which would prate the Creed all over) they vilifie the opinions of the moſt learned, and their private ſpirit of ſeduction will beare them out.

[a] Lib. 11. cap. 9. [a] Ruffinus ſaith thus of Baſil and Gregory Nazianzen, *They were both noblemen, both ſtudents at Athens, both colleagues for thirteen yeares together; all profane learning removed, ſtudied on the holy Scriptures, & followed the ſenſe, not taken from their own preſumption, but from the writings and authority of the ancients; which ancients, it appeared, took the rule of right underſtanding the Scripture, from Apoſtolick ſucceſsion.* S. Baſil himſelf ſaith of himſelf and others, in his Epiſtle to the Church of Antioch, *As for us, we do not take our faith upon truſt from other later men,* [x] *nor dare we deliver to others the conceits of our own brains, leſt mens devices ſhould be thought to be articles of Religion: but what we have been taught of the holy Fathers, that we declare to thoſe that ask of us.* How often doth the divine S. Auguſtine confirm his interpretations by the authority of Cyprian, Ambroſe, and other preceding Fathers? How often doth he confeſſe his own ignorance, though he was the moſt accõpliſhed that ever writ ſince the dayes of the Apoſtles? It was a wiſe obſervation of Scaliger, *That ſome words and paſſages in Plato* [y] *are wiſer then their authour*: and many excellent conceits are collected from Homer and Ariſtotle, which they never dreamed of. But in the Word of God it is contrary. The Spirit was, and is infinite that did dictate it: the finite capacity of man cannot comprehend it: whatſoever good interpretation we finde, may well be thought to be the meaning of the Spirit: and yet the Spirit may, and doth mean many things, which the wit of any man could never diſcloſe. And the true literal ſenſe is the hardeſt to finde.

[x] τὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας διανοίας γεννήματα παραδίδόναι ἢ τολμῶμεν.

[y] *Plus ſapiunt authore.*

I confeſſe I have dwelt too long on this point; but it is to vindicate the authority of our Church from the ſingular fancies of private unskilfull, unlearned, and cenſorious men and women, and to ſhew the madnes of thoſe baſe people-pleaſers or *publicolæ*, who make, or eſteem tradeſmen, and youth, and ill-nurtured, unlettered idiots (yea though their places be eminent) the competent judges of controverſies; whileſt they flee from the

chairs

chairs of the Universities, and from the representative Church of our kingdome, *viz.* the most learned Bishops, and Convocation-house; unto whom they ought to have recourse, and in whose judgement they are, by way of obedience, without opposition to set up their rest. For as for private immediately divine, and infallible revelation, there is none at all; or, if any be, it is in some of those learned ones, who are lawfully called to be the members of our Church representative. And if any defects be in learned men, there are more in unlearned. But of this point otherwhere.

8 Another observation there is, *That kings and supream Officers do represent the people committed to their charge.* And here I will tell you, in honour of the Royall Majesty, what [z] Flavius Josephus saith, *We offer daily sacrifices for the Emperours, and that not onely on ordinary dayes of the common cost of all the Jews, but also when we offer no other sacrifices of the common charge, no not for our children. We give this high honour to the Emperours onely, which we do not give to any other man.* This he saith they practised in the behalf of heathen Emperours, different from them in Religion: how much more ought we, by all lawfull means, exceed them in the honouring of our Kings?

[z] Lib. 2. contra Appionem.

Espencæus calleth a Prince *columbam Dei*, *Gods dove*: Saul is termed *the beauty of Israel*, 2. Sam. 1. 19. David is styled *the light*, *candle*, or *lamp of Israel*, 2. Sam. 21. 17. Josiah was *the breath of our nostrils*, saith Jeremy, Lament. 4. 20. Are not these two latter phrases ideall? are their persons, themselves onely? Again, is not Saul called *the head of the Tribes of Israel?* 1. Sam. 15. 17. and David *the head over Nations?* 2. Sam. 22. 44. [a] Chrysostom intituled Theodosius, *The head and supream over all men on earth.* And therefore, as the people reap benefits extraordinary by their Kings; (for *Saul clothed you in scarlet, with other delights; he put on ornaments of gold upon your apparell*, saith David, 2. Sam. 1. 24.) so for their Kings offences they justly may be punished, 2. Sam. 24. 17. *Lo, I have sinned* (saith David;) *but these sheep, what have they done?* Yet the pestilence, worse then the bane or rot, fell upon those sheep.

[a] Hom. 2. ad popul. Antioch.

Αντὸς γ' Διὸς υἱὸς--βασιλῆι χολωθείς,
Νοῦσον ἀνὰ στρατὸν ὦρσε κακὴν· ὀλέκοντο δὲ λαοί· that is,

Apollo being incensed against the King Agamemnon, sent an evil disease upon his army; and the people perished. The story is memorable, of Saul, 1. Sam. 14. 24, &c. He took a foolish and rash oath, hurtfull to his own souldiers, profitable for the enemy. Neither Jonathan, nor the Captains, nor the people did swear with him, but in him, and by him, and through his oath: yet it bound both the people and himself; yea tied aswell Jonathan,

who heard it not, and knew it not, as thoſe who were preſent, and heard it: for the lot from God drew Jonathan out, as faulty, and puniſhable for his fathers adjuration; who ſware expreſly, by name, the death of Jonathan (if he were faulty) verſ. 39. yet the love of the people delivered him; and (as I think) the father did not much care to break his oath. In this fact Sauls perſon repreſented the whole army; and the people, for their own particular, held themſelves wrapped up to obedience in his oath.

But what do I inſtance in ſlighter matters, when a proof is pregnant, *That the chief governours oaths binde the whole nation & their poſterity for evermore, while their Polity laſted?* Joſhua unadviſedly, without counſelling with God, *made peace and league with the Gibeonites,* (the deſcendants of Canaan, that *ſervant of ſervants*) *to let them live* in the loweſt rank of ſlaves: *and the Princes of the congregation ſware unto them,* Joſh. 9. 15. And though *all the congregation murmured againſt the Princes,* verſ. 18. (from whence I conclude, that the people conſented not to the treaty, much leſſe were ſworn to it) yet the Princes reſolved juſtly and conſcionably, *We have ſworn unto them by the Lord God of Iſrael: now therefore we may not touch them,* verſ. 19. And verſ. 20. thus, *We will even let them live, leſt wrath be upon us, becauſe of the oath which we ſware unto them.* And accordingly Joſhua freed them from the intended ſlaughter of the angry Iſraelites, verſ. 26. That this oath concerned not the people then living onely, but reached alſo unto poſterity, is apparent, 2. Sam. 21. 1, &c. When for the breach of this oath, committed about foure hundred yeares after, the Lord himſelf taxeth *Saul and his bloudy houſe, becauſe he ſlew the Gibeonites;* and therefore ſent purpoſely a triennial famine upon the land; and Gods wrath was not ſatisfied, till the Gibeonites were appeaſed by the death of Sauls poſterity. And theſe 5 things are yet obſervable. Firſt, Saul ſought to ſlay the Gibeonites, *in his zeal to the children of Iſrael and Judah,* v. 2. Secondly, *God commanded Moſes to deſtroy all the inhabitants of the land,* whereof the Gibeonites were part, as they themſelves confeſſed, Joſh. 9. 24. Thirdly, what was the oath of the Princes onely, is ſaid to be the oath of the children of Iſrael, (as it is, 2. Sam. 21. 2.) becauſe it concerned them for ever. Fourthly, after the puniſhment, for this cauſe inflicted, *God was intreated for the land.* Fifthly, it was about foure hundred yeares after the oath of Joſhua and the Princes, when God thus ſeverely vindicated the breach thereof by Saul, upon Sauls poſterity.

9 Laſtly, let us diligently conſider how much Chriſt Jeſus our bleſſed Saviour hath done for us, repreſenting, as it were, our perſons; and what we perform and ſhall obtain in him, and by him.

Iſa 53. 4. *Surely he hath born our griefs, and carried our ſorrows:* which is applied to him, Matth. 8. 19. The force of which words

words is expreſſed by the Apoſtle, 1 Peter 2. 24. *Chriſt his own ſelf bare our ſinnes in his own body on the tree,* (or, *to the tree*, ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον) *and by his ſtripes ye were healed.* S. Paul ſaith, *Chriſt died for our ſinnes*, 1. Corinth. 15. 3. *Chriſt taſted death for every man*, Heb. 2. 9. *Chriſt died for us*, Rom. 5. 8. And in the next verſe, *We be juſtified by his bloud*, and, *We ſhall be ſaved from wrath by him. He hath blotted out the hand-writing of ordinances that was againſt us, which was contrary unto us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his croſſe*, Coloſſ. 2. 14. And, *By him God hath made peace, through the bloud of his croſſe, and reconciled all things unto himſelf by Chriſt*, Coloſſ. 1. verſ. 20. *He hath reconciled you in the body of his fleſh through death, to preſent you holy and unblameable, and unreproveable in his ſight*, verſ. 22. *He was delivered for our offences, and was raiſed again for our juſtification*, Rom. 4. 25. *Ye are buried with him in baptiſme, wherein alſo ye are riſen with him: and you being dead he hath quickned with him*, as it is moſt divinely expreſſed, Coloſſ. 2. 12. 13. *In Chriſt we are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit*, Epheſ. 2. 22. *Our life is hid with Chriſt in God*, Coloſſ. 3. 3. And in the verſe following, *Chriſt is our life. Ye be riſen with Chriſt*, Coloſſ. 3. 1. *God hath quickned us together with Chriſt, and hath raiſed us up together, and made us ſit together in heavenly places in Chriſt Jeſus*, Epheſ. 2. 5, 6. *Our converſation is in heaven*, Philip. 3. 20. From which poſitive proofs, and doctrine, that Chriſt ſtood in our ſtead, and that almoſt all (if not all) his actions and paſſions, as he was the Mediatour between God and man, were repreſentative of us, let us deſcend to the comparative, and ſhew, that Chriſt hath done, and will do more good unto us, then Adam hath done harm. Which point I have more enlarged in my Sermon (at the re-admitting into our Church, of a penitent Chriſtian from Turciſme) being one of the two, intituled, *A return from Argier:* where theſe five reaſons are enlarged. Firſt, that Adam conveyed to us onely one ſinne: but Chriſt giveth diverſities of grace, and many vertues, which Adam and his poſterity ſhould never have had; as patience, virginity, repentance, compaſſion, fraternall correction, martyrdom. Secondly, Adams ſinne was the ſinne of a meer man onely: but the Sonne of God merited for us. Thirdly, by Adams offence we are likened to beaſts; by the grace of Chriſt our nature is exalted above all Angels. Fourthly, Adams diſobedience could not infect Chriſt: Chriſts merit cleanſed Adam, ſaving his ſoul and body. Fifthly, as by the firſt Adam goodnes was deſtroyed; ſo by the ſecond Adam greater goodnes is reſtored, and all puniſhments, yea all our own ſinnes turned to our further good.

To which I will annex theſe things following. By Adams ſinne we were eaſily ſeparated from God: Satan, the woman, and an apple were the onely means: But *I am perſwaded*, (ſaith

the Apoſtle, Rom.8.38.) *that neither death, nor life, nor Angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things preſent, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, ſhall be able to ſeparate us from the love of God.* Again, Rom. 5. 13, &c. the Apoſtle ſeemeth to divide the whole of time in this world, into three parts, under three laws; the law of Nature, of Moſes, of Chriſt. In the firſt ſection of time, ſinne was in the world:— *Neverthelesſe, death reigned from Adam to Moſes*, ſaith the Apoſtle. In the law of Moſes, though death was in the world, yet ſinne chiefly reigned, and the rather for the law:

Nitimur in vetitum ſemper, cupimúſque negatum:

This the Apoſtle confirmeth often, eſpecially Rom. 7. 8. *Sinne taking occaſion, wrought in me all manner of concupiſcence.* The third part of times diviſion is in the dayes of grace, under Chriſt: and now, not ſo much death, not ſo much ſinne, as righteouſnes and life do reigne, or rather we in them, by Chriſt; and the power of both the other is diminiſhed, and ſhall be wholly demoliſhed.

If Adam hurt all mankinde one way or other, Chriſt hath helped all mankinde many wayes. In this life he giveth many bleſſings unto the reprobate: his ſunne ſhineth on all, his rain falleth both upon good and bad: and I do not think, that there ever was the man, at leaſt within the verge of the Church, but had at ſome time or other ſuch a portion of Gods favour, and ſuch ſweet inſpirations put into his heart, that, if he had not quenched by his naturall frowardnes the holy motions of the Spirit, God would have added more grace, even enough to have brought him to ſalvation. For *God is rich in mercy*, Epheſ. 2. 4. *The Father of mercies*, 2. Corinth. 1. 3. *Thou loveſt all things that are, and abhorreſt nothing that thou haſt made: for never wouldeſt thou have made any thing, if thou hadſt hated it*, Wiſd. 11. 24. *What thou doſt abhorre or hate, thou doſt wiſh not to be; what thou doſt make, thou doſt deſire it ſhould be*, ſaith Holcot on the place. In our Common-prayer-book, toward the end of the Commination, this is the acknowledgement of our Church, *O mercifull God, which haſt compaſsion of all men, and hateſt nothing that thou haſt made, which wouldeſt not the death of a ſinner, but that he ſhould rather turn from ſinne, and be ſaved, &c.* God is intituled φιλόψυχος, *Amator animarum, A lover of ſouls*, Wiſd. 11. 26. Holcot on the place confirmeth it by Ezek. 18. 4. *All ſouls are mine*, ſaith God. *Men commonly love the bodies*, ſaith Holcot, *but God the ſouls.* [b] *God loveth the ſouls; not onely, as if he did not love the bodies; but principally, becauſe he hath fitted them for the eternall fruition of himſelf.* It is not the beſt applied diſtinction: for whoſe ſoever ſouls ſhall enjoy God, their bodies alſo ſhall, and that immortally for ever. If he had ſaid, that God had loved humane ſouls *privilegialiter*, becauſe man had nothing to do in their crea-

[b] *Amat Deus animas, non ſingulariter, ſic, quòd non corpora amet; ſed privilegialiter, quia eas ad ſe in perpetuum fruendum præparavit.*

creation or preſervation; he had ſpoken more to the purpoſe. Nor think I, that God forſaketh any, but ſuch as forſake him: but, *Froward thoughts ſeparate from God*--(Wiſd. 1.3. &c.) *For into a malicious ſoul wiſdome ſhall not enter, nor dwell in the body that is ſubject unto ſinne. For the holy ſpirit of diſcipline will flee deceit, and remove from thoughts that are without underſtanding.* Concerning the ſouls of infants, dying without the ordinary antidotes to originall ſinne, baptiſme and the pale of the Church; though they may moſt juſtly be condemned, yet who knoweth how eaſy their puniſhment may be, at leaſt comparatively, as ſome imagine? For, that ſome drops of mercy may extraordinarily diſtill upon them, they cannot deny who ſay, *That the rebellious ſpirits of actually ſinfull men and Angels, are puniſhed citra condignum.* But to leave theſe ſpeculations, I dare boldly affirm, that if there be any mitigation of torments in any of them, it is not without reference to Chriſt.

Moreover the redeeming of man was of more power, then the very creation: for this was performed by a calm *Fiat*; but the redemption was accompliſhed by the agony, paſſion, and death of the Sonne of God. [c] Auguſtine on thoſe words, John 14.12. *Greater works then theſe ſhall he do*, ſaith thus, *It is a greater work, to make a wicked man juſt, then to create heaven and earth:* Therefore much more doth Chriſts merit ſurmount the fault of Adam.

[c] Aug. in Joan. Tractatu 72. poſt medium.

In the firſt Adam we onely had *poſſe non peccare, poſſe non mori, A poßibility of not ſinning, a poßibility of not dying*; (We ſhould have been changed, though we had not died) *poſſe bonum non deſerere, A poßibility of not forſaking goodneſſe:* and ſhould, by his integrity and our endeavours, have attained, at the utmoſt, but *bene agere, & beatificari, To do well, and be bleſſed.* By Chriſt we have not onely remiſſion of ſinnes, and his righteouſnes imputed; but rich grace, abundance of joy, and royall gifts; (*Not a more joyfull, but a more powerfull grace*, ſaith [d] Auguſtine) and we ſhall have *non poſſe peccare, non poſſe mori, An impoßibility of ſinning or dying*, An unchangeable and immortall life, *Non poſſe deſerere bonum, vel adhærere malo, An impoßibility of forſaking goodneſſe, and cleaving to evil*; and not onely *beatitudinem & gloriam*, but *coronam gloriæ, Not onely bleſſedneſſe and glory, but a crown of glory*, Τὸν ἀμαράντινον τῆς δόξης στέφανον, *An immarceſcible crown of glory*, 1. Peter 5.4.

[d] *Non lætiorem, ſed potentiorem gratiam.* Aug. de Correp. & Gratia cap. 11.

Laſtly, if we go to the numbring of them that were hurt by Adam, and the number of thoſe who receive benefit by Chriſt; the greateſt number is on Chriſts ſide. I would be loath to ſay, what the [e] Franciſcane preached publickly at the Councel of Trent, [f] *That they who had no knowledge of Chriſt, and yet had lived honeſtly, had obtained ſalvation.* Nor will I conclude with others, that Ariſtides, Cato, yea Julius Ceſar himſelf is ſaved;

[e] Apud Sleidan pag. 293.

[f] *Eos, qui nullam haberent Chriſti cognitionem, & alioqui vitam egiſſent honeſtè, ſalutem eſſe conſecutos.*

though, according to the fertility of the Italian wits, divers of them have found quaint paſſages and conceits tending that way. Nay, in theſe dayes of preſumption, (wherein, by all likelihood, a thouſand ſurfet and periſh in the hope of mercy, in compariſon of one ſoul ſhip-wracked on the rock of deſpair) I am afraid to confirm what Cœlius ſecundus Curio hath writ, in his books *de Amplitudine regni Chriſti*; or Marſilius Andreaſius of Mantua, *de Amplitudine miſericordiæ Chriſti*, before him; who maintaineth, *That farre more are ſaved by Chriſt, then are condemned.* For though Chriſt ſaith, Matth. 7.13. *Enter ye in at the ſtrait gate; for wide is the gate, and broad is the way that leadeth to deſtruction, and many there be which go in thereat:* and verſ. 14. *Strait is the gate, and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that finde it:* and though divers other paſſages of Scripture (by *the little flock*, and *few labourers*, with the like phraſes) ſeem to import the paucity of humane ſouls ſaved, in compariſon of the many condemned: yet he reſtraineth all thoſe places to the dayes of Chriſt; when indeed few beleeved, in reſpect of the unbeleevers: and the emphaſis may accordingly be ſet upon that word YE; *Enter* YE. And, perhaps, the antitheſis is obſervable, *Many there be which* GO *in to the wide gate, and broad way*; but it is not ſaid, *Few* SHALL *go in at the narrow gate*; nor, *Few* SHALL *enter in*: but, *Few there* BE *that finde it.* And it may be expounded, *Few there be that finde it; by themſelves*, or *by their own naturall power, without patefaction divine.* But what they cannot finde without a guide, they may finde by a guide: and many may enter in at Chriſt the Doore, and many may walk in Chriſt the Way. *Where ſin abounded, grace* may *much more abound. As by one mans diſobedience many were made ſinners: ſo by the obedience of one* may *many be made righteous.* Concerning which places, with the precedent verſes, Rom. 5. we ſhall treat by and by. But I return to their anſwer, That reſpect was had to the primitive dayes of Chriſts Church; and, That we are to conſider, that when Chriſt likened *the Kingdome of God to a grain of muſtard ſeed, which waxed a great tree; and to leaven, which leavened the whole* lump, Luke 13. 18, &c. he ſpake not without reference to his own dayes, in which they were generally perſwaded, (as the Papiſts are now) that many were eaſily ſaved in their Church: whereupon one wondering at Chriſts doctrine, of the hardly obtaining of heaven, and that by few, ſaith (Luke 13.23.) *Lord, are there few that be ſaved?* And Chriſt anſwereth, not without reſpect to thoſe times, *Strive to enter in at the ſtrait gate: for many will ſeek to enter in, and ſhall not be able:* becauſe they ſought awry, and refuſed the right way offered. Yet many might be ſaved, and more in after-times then at that preſent time; more by farre in the Church of Chriſt growing and increaſing, then in the Church of the

Jews,

Jews, waning and decreasing. Yea, at this present, though a diligent computer shall not finde much fault with me, for saying, that, if the world were divided, for places and people, into thirty parts, Nineteen thereof are Infidels, six of the Mahometane Religion, and five of the Christian, the Romane Church and the Reformed Churches making but one part of the five; (so that the Greek Churches may more brag of their Catholicisme, then the Romane; and the scabbed petite flock, and schismaticall parlour-full, yea scarce hand-full of Separatists of Amsterdam, may cease to claim themselves to be the onely Church, by their paucity; which the least number of the never-agreeing, and subdivided Brethren may appropriate to themselves; excluding by that argument all the Churches of the world besides, yea even their own fellow-schismaticks) yet this I will be bold to say, that many places of the Prophets in the old Testament, and many in the New, did and do foresignifie, that great abundance of men, women, and children of all nations, of all places, shall be saved by Christ; that there shall be (as it were) *Mundus hominum electorum, A world of elect men, a great multitude of men, which no man could number*, Rev. 7. 9.

Unto which number of humane souls, if we annex those *thousand thousands* of Angels, *and ten thousand times ten thousand*, Daniel 7. 10. even that innumerable host also; we may confidently averre, what Elishah said of the blessed Angels in an other case, 2. Kings 6. 16. *They which be with us, are more then they that be with our enemies*, or, *more then our enemies*. More in number enjoy eternall life by Christ, then are condemned to eternall death by Adam. For though Christ be not a Mediatour of *redemption* unto the Angels; yet was he a Mediatour of *confirmation in grace*; and whatsoever blessings they did, or do, or shall enjoy, they had it for and by the merit of Christ foreseen. For *he is the head of the Church*, and they be but *members*: and all the vertue or happinesse in the body, or in any part of it, is derived from the head. *All things visible and invisible, thrones, dominions, principalities, powers, were created by him, and for him*, Coloss. 1. 16. *In him all fulnesse dwelleth*, vers. 19. *From him the whole body is fitly joyned together*, Ephes. 4. 16. *In him all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy Temple*, Ephes. 2. 21. *And of his fulnesse have all we received, and grace for grace*, John 1. 16. And not we alone, but the good Angels also were predestinated, created, confirmed, and glorified by his means, as Suarez well concludeth, in his Commentaries on the third part of Aquine his Summe, Tom. 1. pag. 656. [g] *I say*, saith he, *that Christ merited for the Angels grace, and glory, which was given them for the merits of Christ foreseen.* So Aquinas, Cajetan, Albertus, [h] Marsilius, [i] Jacobus de Valentia, [k] Melchior Flavius, [l] Arboreus. And again, the same Suarez pag. 65. 8. [m] *The Lord Christ hath*

[g] *Dico Christum meruisse Angelis gratiam, & gloriam, quæ illis data fuerat propter merita Christi prævisa.*
[h] *Sentent. 3. Distinct. 13. Artic. 1.*
[i] *In illud, Psal. 102.* BENEDICITE DOMINO OMNIA OPERA EIUS.
[k] *Lib de Regno Christi.*
[l] *Theosophiæ, 2. 13.*
[m] *Christus Dominus meruit sanctis Angelis omnia dona gratiæ, exceptis iis quæ ad remedium peccati pertinent: meruit iis electionem, prædestinationem, vocationem, auxilia omnia excitantia, adjuvantia, sufficientia, & efficacia; denique, omne meritum & augmentum gratiæ & gloriæ.*

hath merited for the holy Angels all gifts of grace, except thoſe which belong to the remedy of ſinne. He hath merited for them election, predeſtination, vocation, all means exciting, helping, ſufficient, and effectuall: Laſtly, all merit and increaſe of grace and glory. As *the precious ointment, upon the head of Aaron, ran down upon his beard, and thence deſcended to the skirts of his garments,* Pſal. 133. 2. ſo all vertue diſtilleth from Chriſt the Head, upon every member of his Church, Angelicall, or Humane; Triumphant, or Militant: neither have they ought, but what they received, and from him onely. In brief, we have exchanged, and bartred our braſſe for gold; [n] *We had periſhed, if we had not periſhed,* as Themiſtocles ſaid of old. [o] *O happy fault, that hath obtained ſo great and excellent a Redeemer!* Chriſt hath done us more good, then Adam did himſelf or us hurt.

[n] *Periiſſemus, niſi periiſſemus.*
[o] *O felix culpa, quæ tantum & talem meruit Redemptorem!*

If theſe my humble private ſpeculations, or rather relations of other mens opinions, give not ſatisfaction; I deſire you to have recourſe unto the Apoſtle, who hath put the firſt and ſecond Adam into the balances; and behold, the firſt Adam is found too light. In which comparative, being like in the *genus*, and unlike in the *ſpecies*, (as Origen ſoundly and wittily obſerved) Firſt let us ſee the ὅμοια, *the things wherein they are like.* Rom. 5. 12. *As by one man ſinne entred into the world, and death by ſinne:* the Apodoſis is not expreſſed, but thus to be conceived, *So by one man grace came into the world, and life by grace.* See the ſame confirmed, v. 19, 20. Secondly, *As by one mans diſobedience many were made ſinners; ſo by the obedience of one, ſhall many be made righteous.* The third thing wherein they were like, is ſet down in the 18. verſe; of which hereafter.

Concerning the ἀνόμοια, *the things wherein they differ*, they are ſet down in the 15 verſe, and ſo downward: *Not as the offence, ſo alſo is the free gift. For if through the offence of one, many be dead; much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jeſus Chriſt, hath abounded unto many.* An other diſſimilitude is in the 16 verſe, *And not as it was by one that ſinned, ſo is the gift: for the judgement was by one to condemnation; but the free gift is of many offences unto juſtification.* And verſe 17, *If by one mans offence, death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteouſneſſe, ſhall reigne in life by one, Jeſus Chriſt.* After this, he returneth to the third point of their compariſon (the ἀνόμοια, *the things wherein they differ*, being involved in a Parentheſis) which indeed may ſeem at the firſt ſight more ſtrange, *Therefore as by the offence of one, judgement came upon all men to condemnation: even ſo by the righteouſnes of one, the free gift came upon all men unto juſtification of life*, verſ. 18. But the true meaning is this, according to the way of S. Auguſtine: As none cometh to death, but by Adam; and none to Adam, but by death: ſo none cometh to life, but by Chriſt; nor

nor to Christ,but by life. Thus the free gift came on al,as the offence came on all. As when we say, All entred into the house by one doore;it is not intended or included, that all that ever were; farre or nigh,came thither, into the house; but that no man entred into the house,save by the doore: So though the Apostle saith *Omnes*, in the application;he meaneth not, that all and every one are justified;but that all that are justified, are not otherwise justified then by Christ:and this is S. Augustines exposition, against Julian the Pelagian,6.12. As if he had said,*Christ is the* A *and* Ω,*the beginning,means,and end. There is none other name by which we must be saved*, Acts 4.12. *He perfecteth them for ever who are sanctified*, Hebr. 10. 14. *And they are Christs, and Christ is Gods*, 1. Cor. 3.23. ὁ ἐμὸς ἔρως ἀυτὸς ἐστι, *He is my love & delight*, said Ignatius. And I professe, I desire not heaven, or the blessednes of heaven without him,as I,undeserving,ill-deserving,poore I,hope to reigne in life by him onely, who giveth spirituall birth,life,and increase, till he bring us unto blessednesse; even all them who are saved, even the universality of the chosen in Christ. The limitation of the word *Omnis* is frequent in Scriptures; not comprehending generally, or universally every one in all, and all with every one;but being put for a great number, for many: Luke 6.26. *Wo unto you when all men shall speak well of you:* where *All* must not be tentered and stretched to its utmost extent; for all and every did never, do never, and never shall, speak well of them. So Acts 22. 15. *Thou shalt be witnesse unto all men*, saith Ananias to S. Paul: which was not accomplished, if *All* have no restraint. Again, Titus 2. 11. *The grace of God which bringeth salvation, hath appeared to all men*: and yet there were then, and now are many, who never saw or knew that salutiferous or saving grace. So here you are to reduce the word *Omnes*, to *omnes sui*; *All that are in Christ*, saith the Glosse. Again,why may not *All* be aswell taken for *Many* in this our 18 vers.as *Many* is taken for *All* in the 19 verse? where it is said, *By one mans disobedience many were made sinners*: when all and every one that descended ordinarily and naturally from Adam, sinned in him and by him, as is expressed, verse 12. and proved before, Genes. 17. 4. *Thou shalt be a father of many nations*; which is repeated word for word, Rom.4.17. and is thus varied, Genes. 22. 18. *In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed*: and this is confirmed, Galat.3.8. where *Many* and *All* differ not in sense and substance.

By *Omnes homines*, *All men*, you may understand *Humanum genus*, *Mankinde*; and because all mankinde must be distinguished into two sorts, goats and sheep; and considered according to two estates, fallen and repaired; and their different receptacles, the two cities; the one the city of God, the other of the Devil; in the first member the word *All* must be interpreted generally, without restriction; because in it was speech of Adam, by whom

whom death came upon all, without exception: but in the ſecond and oppoſite member, *All* is not to be taken in the ſame amplitude, *ſed juxta rem ſubjectam, But according to the ſubject ſpoken of: All that have grace, and the gift of righteouſneſſe: Omnes vivificandi, All that are to be made alive,* ſaith S. Auguſtine; *All that are Chriſts.*

So much in defence of thoſe who by *All* underſtand *genera ſingulorum*, but not *ſingula generum, Some of all kindes, but not all of every kinde*; reſtraining and impriſoning the word, yet, as it were, *in libera cuſtodia. The free gift came upon all men to the juſtification of life,* that is, it came upon all, upon whom it did come, freely: and yet upon many, which were not of Chriſts flock, it came not at all. If this ſeem harſh to any, there is a ſecond interpretation, which came in my minde before ever I had heard or read, that any other thought ſo: and amongſt a whole army of expounders, I never met with any who wholly agreeth with me; and never but one, whoſe opinion, in part, concurreth with mine: and he is Cardinall Tolet, who is found fault withall covertly, by Juſtinian the Jeſuit, and by the learned Eſtius, under a generall *Quidam vir doctus, A certain learned man*; and expreſſely by name by Cornelius à Lapide the Jeſuit: whoſe judgement otherwiſe I had been ignorant of, as not having Tolets labours on the Romanes. The words of S. Paul, Rom. 5. 18. at the latter end, are theſe, *By the righteouſneſſe of one,* (Δι' ἑνὸς δικαιώματος, εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς) *the free gift came upon all men unto juſtification of life.* So it is read (according to the Vulgat) in our late Tranſlation: the Biſhops Bible hath it, *Good ſpringeth upon all men to the righteouſneſſe of life:* but it is certainly amiſſe; for they take δικαίωσις for δικαιοσύνη· whereas there is great diſcrepancy between them: for δικαιοσύνη is generally confeſſed to be (according to Philoſophers) that vertue, or aggregation of vertue, which is named *Juſtice generall*: or (according to Divinity) the vertue, or the habit of juſtice, the work of grace, ſanctification, righteouſneſſe, or holineſſe inherent. Neither is δικαίωσις all one with δικαίωμα. for though I would be loath to ſay, as Beza doth on that place; *I do not admit,* ſaith he, *that theſe two are all one,* for this reaſon among others, *Leſt ſome vain nicety ſhould be attributed to the Apoſtle, that is, to the holy Ghoſt*; (for if I did admit them to be all one, yet I would rather admire the depths of the holy Spirit, which I am not able to ſound, then aſcribe any empty or vain nicety to the perfection of divine Scripture; [1] *Whoſe plenitude I adore,* that I may uſe Tertullians phraſe: whereas Beza intimateth, as if the infinite Spirit knew not to dictate what he could not underſtand) yet will I be bold to ſay, there is a main difference between them. δικαίωμα commonly is rendred *juſtificatio*: For grant, that among Heathen writers δικαίωμα be now and then expreſſed, *A juſt cauſe,* or *The ground-*

Nè inanis quædam argutia tribuatur Apoſtolo, id eſt, Spiritui ſancto.

[1] *Adoro Scripturæ plenitudinem.* Tert. lib. contra Hermog.

ground-work or *foundation of a just cause*, as[l] Aristotle useth it. Grant we also, that in Scripture δικαίωμα is used sometimes for *the judgement of God*, as Rom. 1. 32. and Revel. 15. 4; sometimes for *the ordinances of God*, as Luke 1. 6. and Heb. 9. 1, and 10 verses, and Rom. 2. 26: yet most properly it is rendred *Justificatio*, and by it is meant the merit of Christ, and his righteousnesse imputed to us; and is in Christ, and not in us. Beza saith right in this, [m] *The word* δικαίωμα, *Justification, declareth (as I may say) the very matter of our justification from the effect, namely that obedience of Christ, the imputation whereof makes us righteous in him: which a little before he called* χάρισμα, *the free gift; because God gives it freely to us.* Thus is *the imputation of Christs righteousnesse* and *our justification* all one in effect, and onely divers in words to the same sense. Thus δικαίωμα is used both in the 16 verse, and in this present place: and thus Rev. 19. 8. *The fine linen is the righteousnes of Saints:* Not of themselves, not inherent: for to the Church *was given*, or *granted, that she should be arayed (ut cooperiat se,* as some reade it; ἵνα περιβάληται βύσσινον καθαρὸν καὶ λαμπρόν*) in fine linen, pure & white:* καθαρόν, *pure* in it self; λαμπρόν, *white* to be seen by others. And since our Saviour, Revel. 19. 13. *was clothed with a vesture dipt in bloud*; which Blasius Viegas saith, is commonly interpreted of Christs humanitie begored with its own bloud, by the Jews (which suffer me to term *Meritum rubrum*, as well as the School-men stile it *Meritum udum*) which was pointed at, Esai 63. 1. *Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah?* and verse 2. *Wherefore art thou red in thine apparell, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the wine-fat?* which Tertullian wittily thus expounded, [n] *The spirit of the Prophet contemplating, as it were, his Lord going to his passion, clothed with flesh, as suffering in it, describes by the redness of his garments the bloudy habit of his flesh troden and pressed by the force of his pasion, as by a wine-presse; because men come out thence, as it were, all bloudy with the redness of the wine:* According to that propheſied of him, rather then of Judah; or of Judah, as a type of him, Gen. 49. 11. *He washed his garments in wine, and his clothes in the bloud of grapes.* So that S. John may be thought to expound Esai, and Esai to reflect on that propheſie of Jacob; and all to designe out our Saviours passive obedience, by which (that I may so speak) our sinnes are most properly washed away, or not imputed. Upon proportionable semblance of reason, permit me to say, that the pure and white linen describeth Christs active obedience, his fulfilling of the Law, in number, weight, and measure: (which the School-men call *Meritum siccum, a drie merit*; and I, *Meritum candidum, a white merit*) which actions and performances of his, are as the fine linen with which the Saints are properly clothed and apparelled, when they are imputed to us. And thus, to return to my old matter, δικαιώματα in the place of

[l] 1. *de cœlo.*

[m] Δικαίωμα *ipsam justificationis nostræ (ut ità dicam) materiam hîc declarat ab effecto, nempe illam Christi obedientiam, cujus imputatio nos justos in ipso facit; quam paulò antè vocavit* χάρισμα, *quòd Deus gratis eam nobis largiatur.*

[n] *Spiritus propheticus, veluti jam contemplans Dominum suum ad passionem venientem, carne scilicet vestitum, ut in ea passum, cruentum habitum carnis in vestimentorum rubore designat conculcata & expressa vi passionis, tanquam de foro torcularis; quia exinde quasi cruentati homines de vini rubore descendunt.* Contra Marcionem, 4. 40.

the Revelation is taken for the merits of Chriſt, clothing us with fine linen; as Jacob was with his elder brothers clothes, when he was to receive the bleſſing, Geneſ. 27.15. ſo we with his righteouſneſſe, which is aſcribed unto us, as if it were our own; and now called *ours*, becauſe it was given unto *us* by *Him*. Yet thirdly and laſtly, beſides theſe two words, δικαιοσύνη and δικαίωμα, the Apoſtle uſeth another verball, differing from both: and that is δικαίωσις· which (under correction) I opine is not to be tranſlated, either, with the Biſhops Bible, *righteouſneſſe of life* (for that is coincident with δικαιοσύνη·) nor yet *juſtification*, or *Chriſts righteouſneſſe*; for then it were all one with δικαίωμα, which was immediately before aſcribed to Chriſt. But what is then δικαίωσις; & how is it to be tranſlated? It is but twice uſed in the New Teſtament. Firſt, Rom. 4.25. ἠγέρθη διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν. *He was raiſed again for our juſtification.* But ſome Greek Copies have δικαιοσύνην; in ſtead of δικαίωσιν, in that place; and then the ſenſe altereth of it ſelf. Beza ſaith, δικαίωσις in the fifth to the Romanes ſignifieth more then it doth in the fourth; and ſeemeth thus to difference it, That, in Romanes the fourth, *the paſsive obedience imputed* is underſtood; and, in Romanes the fifth, *the active obedience imputed* is meant. And though in both places he doth Latinize it, *Juſtificatio*; yet the new-coined words of *Juſtificamen*, or *Juſtificamentum*, ſeem better in his judgement to expreſſe the ſenſe in the latter place. In this he ſaith wittily, that δικαίωσις is oppoſed τῷ κατακρίματι. And this is the onely argument of worth againſt the following opinion. Yet thus it may be anſwered, That though κατάκριμα be expounded *damnation*, or *condemnation*, or *a ſentence damnatorie*, as Beza calleth it; yet Beza himſelf will not tranſlate δικαίωσις, [p] *a ſentence abſolutorie*, or *ſaving*. For there is no neceſſitie, that a direct oppoſition, in all parts, ſhould be between thoſe terms; neither doth the nature of the *antitheſis* neceſſarily require ſuch an exact contradiction. But how doth Tolet render and interpret theſe words? [q] *He thinks* (ſaith Cornelius à Lapide of him) *that by the words* JUSTIFICATIO VITÆ, *The juſtification of life*, (which in the Vulgat is the expoſition of our δικαίωσις ζωῆς) *is here meant that action or operation whereby God through the righteouſneſſe & merit of Chriſt will raiſe up all men, even the reprobate, from death to a life for ever to endure.* And ſo the ſimilitude between Adam & Chriſt is every way compleat: for as by Adams ſinne all & every one die; ſo by Chriſts merit all & every one ſhall be made alive. And certainly for the truth of Tolets opinion, it is a part of our Creed, & denied of none: & it is expreſly avouched, even in the ſame comparative form, 1. Cor. 15.22. *As in Adam all die, even ſo in Chriſt ſhall all be made alive.* But my opinion herein differeth from Tolets, That I do make, not onely Gods power & the merits of Chriſt concurring to this ἀνάστασις, but alſo make δικαίωσις (which is more com-

[p] *Sententia abſolutoria, vel ſalvifica.*

[q] *Putat juſtificationem vitæ hîc appellari actionem & operationem, quâ Deus, ex juſtitia & merito Chriſti, omnes homines, etiam reprobos, à morte ſuſcitabit ad vitam perpetuò duraturam.*

commonly, then properly rendred *justificatio*) to be an act of man defending and pleading for himself, at the resurrection. As if the Apostle had thus balanced Adam and Christ: *As by the offence of the one, judgement came upon all to condemnation: so by the righteousnesse of the other, the free gift came upon all, that they shall all, without exception, be raised up; to know the cause, why they deserve wrath; to excuse themselves, if they can; to plead in their own defence, if they can justifie their lives, and free themselves from condemnation.* (For God condemneth no man without reason, nor without suffering him to come to his answer, nor without letting him see and know the just cause of his condemnation.) The substantiall truth whereof is confirmed, Rom. 14. 10. *We shall all stand before the judgement-seat of Christ, and every one of us shall give an account of himself to God*, vers. 12. The end is specialized, 2. Corinth. 5. 10, *That every one may receive the things done in the body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.* As for the objection of our adversaries, and their demand, where the word δικαίωσις is so used in Scripture: I first retort it thus; Let them prove the use of the word, in Scripture, as they apply it. Secondly, I say, It is *iniquum postulatum, An unjust demand* on either side; since the word is onely once, onely here, in the New Testament, without variation of reading, so farre as I remember. Thirdly, I think that δικαίωσις is opposed to ἀντιδικία, crosse-pleading, and all one with δικαιολογία, as * Suidas expounds it: and what is δικαιολογία, but *causificatio, causæ suæ defensio, juris sui in medium prolatio?* 2. Maccab. 4. 44. ἐπ' αὐτῷ τῷ δικαιολογίαν ἐποιήσαντο, *They pleaded the cause before him.* Yet nearer to the purpose, Psal. 43. 1. *Plead thou my cause*, δίκασον τῷ δίκην μου *Litiga litem meam*, as it is in the Interlineary; *Disceptando tuere causam meam*, as Vatablus interprets it. And Psal. 35. 23. *Awake to my judgement, even unto my cause:* The Septuagint have it, εἰς τὴν δίκην μου and Symmachus readeth it, εἰς τὴν δικαίωσίν μου. Where David makes God a Judge and Umpire, between David himself pleading his own cause, and Davids adversaries who pleaded against him, *and opened their mouth wide against him*, vers. 21. So that with Symmachus, δικαίωσις is exactly the pleading of ones own cause, as here δικαίωσις ζωῆς is the defence of a mans thoughts, words, and deeds in this world, and may in a good sense be called *a justification of his life.* Moreover, it is said, Exod. 12. 49. *Lex una erit indigenæ, & peregrino, One law shall be unto him that is home-born, and unto the stranger.* Which is diversified, Levit. 24. 22. *Ye shall have one manner of law: Judicium unum erit vobis*, as the Interlineary readeth it; it being מִשְׁפָּט here, whereas in the place of Exodus it was תּוֹרָה. Also in the Septuagint, the first place is thus, Νόμος εἷς ἔσται· and in Leviticus, Δικαίωσις μία ἔσται· where δικαίωσις may well be expounded *one manner of pleading their causes*, as there was one law. This I am sure of, the verb is so used, Micah

* Apud Lysiam.

7. 9. *I will bear the indignation of the Lord, becauſe I have ſinned againſt him,* ἕως τᾶ δικαιῶσαι αὐτὸν τὴν δίκην μϰ, *untill he plead my cauſe.* Why may not then δικαίωσις be the pleading of ones cauſe? And why may not the meaning of our Apoſtle be, That as Adam was *oſtium mortis, The doore of death:* ſo Chriſt is *clavis reſurrectionis, The key of the reſurrection:* as Tertullian ſweetly calleth him: And as by Adam all and every one was guilty of death and damnation: ſo by Chriſts merit every one ſhall ariſe, to free himſelf from it, if he can; and to plead wherefore he ſhould not be condemned; to defend himſelf, and anſwer for himſelf, as Paul did, Acts 26. 2. to apologize: And herein Adam and Chriſt to be like, That as every one was made guilty, by one, of condemnation: ſo every one, for Chriſts all-ſufficient condignity, ſhall be permitted, yea enabled, to ſpeak for himſelf, why the ſentence ſhall not be executed. But theſe things I leave to the Profeſſours of the Greek tongue, and *ſuo quiſque judicio abundet.*

So much for the ſecond expoſition of the words, and for the ſimilitudes and diſſimilitudes between Adam and Chriſt; from which reſulteth, That Adam repreſenting us, did not ſo much hurt us, as Chriſt repreſenting us did do good unto us. And therefore, ſince we are acquitted from ſinne, from all ſinnes, originall and actuall; ſince we are acquitted from eternall death, and have grace, and abundance of grace, and the gift of righteouſneſſe, and ſhall have life eternall, and ſhall reigne in life, by ones obedience, by one onely Jeſus Chriſt, who in his life, and on the altar of the croſſe merited all theſe things for us: it is no hard meaſure, no iniquity of God, if for Adams ſinne and diſobedience, when he ſuſtained our perſons, both himſelf and his poſterity in his loyns, implicitly conſenting with him, be appointed to die. And thus much ſhall ſuffice for the firſt generall Queſtion upon the words of the Text. The ſecond followeth.

Druſius towards the end of his Preface before his book called *Enoch*, thus, * *Theſe, and other things which are contained in this book, as alſo in all other books which have been or ſhall be ſet forth by me, I willingly ſubmit to the cenſure of the Catholick Church; from whoſe right judgement if I diſſent, I will not be pertinacious.*

* *Hæc, & alia quæ hoc libro continentur, ut & in aliis omnibus à me unquam editis aut edendis, ſubjicio libens Eccleſiæ Catholicæ judicio; à cujus recto ſenſu ſi diſſentio, non ero pertinax.*

O

O Deity incomprehenſible, and Trinity in Unity, in all reſpects ſuperexcellent and moſt admirable; with all the faculties of my ſoul and body I humbly beg of thee to ſhew thy mercy upon me, for Jeſus Chriſt his ſake: and O bleſſed Redeemer, accept my prayer, and preſent it with favour to the throne of grace, where thou canſt not be denied. If thou, O gracious Jeſu, art not able to help me, and to ſave my ſinfull ſoul; let me die comfortleſſe, and let my ſoul periſh: but ſince thy power is infinite, I beſeech thee to make me one of thoſe whom thou bringeſt to more happineſſe, then all our enemies could bring to miſerie. Heare me, for thy tender mercies ſake, and for thy glorious name, O great Mediatour Jeſu Chriſt.

AMEN, AMEN.

BRITISH
20JY74
MUSEUM

MISCELLANIES OF DIVINITIE.

THE SECOND BOOK.

CHAP. I.

Sect. I. THe *question propounded, and explained.*
2. *Armenius, or rather his sonne Zoroaster, dead, and revived.*
3. *Antillus dead, and living again, because the messenger of death mistook him, instead of Nicandas: Nicandas died in his stead.*
4. *A careless Christian died, and recovered life: lived an Anchorite twelve yeares: died religiously.*

SECT. I.

THe second Question, which, from the words of my Text, I propounded, is this: Whether such as have been raised from the dead, did die the second time, yea, or no? because it is said, *It is appointed for men once to die.* I speak not of those who have been thought to be dead, and have been stretch't out, and yet their soul hath been within them; though divers, for divers daies, and upon severall sicknesses, have had neither heat, nor breathing discernable: but onely of such, who have suffered a true separation of their souls from their bodies: Whether these have again delivered up the ghost, and died, I make my question.

2. Before I come to mention those whom the Scripture recordeth to be truly raised, I hold it not amisse, to propound to your view a few stories out of other authours. Theodoret, *lib.* 10. *de fine & judicio*, hath two strange relations. The first is out of Plato, of one Armenius: but Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromat.* 5. relateth from Zoroaster himself, that it was Zoroaster,

the ſonne of Armenius; *He who onely, of all the world, laughed ſo ſoon as he was born* (ſaith Plin. 7. 16.) *and was ſo famous a Magician*: One of theſe two, either father or ſonne, the twelfth day after he and others fell in the battell, and was to be buried, *ante pyram conſtitutus, revixit*, and being come to himſelf, told what he had ſeen *apud inferos*: namely, that his ſoul being divided from his bodie, came with many others, (who died with him) to an admirable and incredible place, in which there were two gulfs, opes, or ruptures of the earth: and two open places of heaven right over them. In the midſt of theſe *hiatus*, or gulfs, judges did ſit; who, when judgement was ended, bade the juſt ſouls aſcend by the heavenly opennes and gaps: the judges ſowing on their breaſts, the notes of their judgement. But the ſouls of the wicked men were commanded to go on the left hand, and to be hurried to hell, carrying with them, on their backs, the memoriall of their paſſed life. But as for himſelf, being now come in ſight, the judges bade him diligently heare and ſee all things, and tell all thoſe things which were done, when he revived. *Theſe are ſayings worthy of Philoſophy*, ſaith Theodoret.

3 A ſecond ſtorie is cited in the ſame place, by Theodoret, from Plutarch, among thoſe things which he wrote *De anima. Soſitiles, Heracleon, and I* (ſaith Plutarch) *were preſent, when Antillus told us this, of himſelf: The Phyſicians thought Antillus to be dead: but he came to himſelf, as one out of a deep ſleep, and neither ſaid, nor did any other thing,* * *which might argue him to be crazy or light-headed: but he told us, that he was dead, and that he was again revived, and that his death, upon that ſickneſſe, was not altogether irrevocable: but that the meſſengers, who brought him to judgement, were ſharply blamed by their governours, becauſe they brought Antillus in ſtead of Nicandas. Within a while after, Nicandas died, and Antillus recovered life and health.* And Plutarch, in my opinion, ſeemeth to inſinuate, that he was preſent at the recovery of him. Of both theſe (if each particular were true, that they were dead, and relived) we may boldly averre, that they died again. Neither doth Plato, Plutarch, or Theodoret doubt of it. As ſtrange a ſtorie, though more remote from our ſubject, you ſhall finde in Alexander ab Alexandro, *Genialium dierum*, 6. 21.

* *Quod exactæ mentis ſignum poſſit cenſeri.*

4 An other iſtance you ſhall finde in Bellarmine, *De arte bene moriendi, lib. 2. cap. 1.* taken out of Joannes Climachus, *in ſcala ſua, grad. 6.* who relates thus of a man, that died twice: *In his firſt life* (ſaith he) *he lived moſt negligently: but dying, and his ſoul being perfectly ſeparated from his bodie, after one houre, he returned again, and he deſired Climachus, and the reſt, to depart. Whereupon they walled up the cell, and he lived (as an Anchoret) within the cell, twelve yeares; ſpeaking to no man till he was ready to die again; eating nothing but bread, and drinking water: ſitting ſo, he aſtoniſhed-*

aſtoniſhedly revolved thoſe things onely, which he had ſeen in his ſeparation, with ſo earneſt a thought, that he never changed countenance, but continuing in that amazement, ſecretly wept bitterly. When he was at deaths doore the ſecond time, they forced open the entrance into the cell, and coming to him, humbly deſired him to ſpeak ſome words of doctrine. He anſwered nothing but this onely, [b] *The ſerious remembrance of death will not conſiſt with ſinne.* The like ſtorie you may finde in Venerable Bede.

All theſe, if they lived again, died again, and roſe not to life immortall. And in this ſenſe is that averred, Wiſd. 2. 1: *Never was any man known to have returned from the grave*; viz. not to die again: for otherwiſe, ſome were known to have been raiſed. From theſe I come more eſpecially to ſpeak of ſuch, whom the word of God reporteth to have been raiſed.

[b] *Nemo qui revera mortis memoriam agnoverit, peccare unquam poterit.*

Moſt gracious God, who didſt breathe into the face of man the breath of life, and at thy pleaſure draweſt it forth again out of his noſtrils; grant that we make ſuch uſe of this preſent life, that we may ſee, love, and enjoy thee in the life eternall, through Jeſus Chriſt our onely Lord and Saviour.

Amen.

CHAP. II.

1. *A diviſion of ſuch as have been raiſed. They all died.*
2. *The widow of Zarephath her ſonne raiſed, yet died again: ſuppoſed to be Jonas the Prophet. The Shunammites ſonne raiſed, not to an eternall, but to a temporary reſurrection. A good, and a better reſurrection.*
3. *Chriſt the firſt who roſe, not to die again.*
4. *The man raiſed in the ſepulchre of Eliſha, aroſe not to immortality.*

1. AND becauſe divers have been raiſed up, of whom there is not the like doubt, and anſwer in each kinde to be made, I will therefore diſtribute them, in regard of their times, into three ſorts:

Such as were raiſed { 1. Before Chriſts death. 2. After he was aſcended. 3. About the time of his death.

Which inverted method I purpoſely chooſe, becauſe I will reſerve the hardeſt point to the laſt.

The firſt ſort again is ſubdivided into ſuch as were raiſed, either before Chriſt was incarnated, or by Chriſt himſelf.

They who were raiſed before Chriſt was born, were three:

1. The widow of Zarephath her ſonne, 1.King. 17.22.
2. The Shunammites ſonne, 2.King.4.35.
3. A dead man who was caſt into the grave of Eliſha, *and when he touched the bones of Eliſha, he revived, and ſtood upon his feet*, 2.King.13.21.

All theſe three were raiſed up to live, and lived to die again. Neither did the intention of ſuch as requeſted to have them raiſed, or of ſuch as raiſed them, aim once, that they ſhould live immortally: but live onely on earth again as other men did, and then die again. Neither did I ever reade any, who held theſe to ariſe to immortall glory: neither ſtands it with reaſon. For that they were once dead and raiſed to life, the Scripture ſaith: and that they muſt either live to this time, or be tranſlated to immortall glorie in their bodies, or die, is as true as Scripture. Now, becauſe there is no ground to ſay, that they yet live, or were tranſlated bodily into heaven; there is good ground to conclude, that again they died.

2. Concerning the firſt of theſe: the Jews think he was Jonas the Prophet: and S. Hierome, in his Prologue on Jonas, citeth their opinion, and diſlikes it not. Toſtatus alſo ſaith, *Divers others think ſo.* If Jonas were the widow of Zarephath her ſonne, we know that Jonas died afterward: for *the Prophets are dead*, Joh. 8. 53. and he was one of the Prophets. And concerning both the firſt and ſecond inſtance, it is thought by many good Authours, that they are pointed at, Heb.11.35. *The women received their dead raiſed to life again*: or, *the Prophets delivered to the women their dead*, as the Syriack reads it; that is, to converſe with them as formerly, being raiſed not to an eternall, but a temporary reſurrection; and ſo to die again at their appointed times. And to this truth the Text it ſelf giveth in evidence: for it is ſaid in the ſame verſe, ἵνα κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως τύχωσι, *that they might obtain a better reſurrection.*

Of holy men there is a double reſurrection; the firſt, and the laſt; the good, and the better. The reſurrection mentioned in the beginning of the verſe was good: and *with reference to the former* (ſaith Chryſoſtom) *the latter reſurrection is called the better.* For the former was *temporary*, the latter *eternall*, called alſo *The holy reſurrection* in our book of Common Prayer, in the Epiſtle on the fixth Sunday after Trinity; though there is no ſubſtantiall ground for the word *holy*, either in the Latine, or Greek, Rom.6.5. Of the former, Aquinas, in his Comment on Hebr. 11. 35. ſaith it was rather a *reſuſcitation* then a *reſurrection*: and again, [c] *Theſe being raiſed died again, but Chriſt riſing from the dead, dieth no more*, Rom.6.9.

[c] *Iſti ſic reſuſcitati, ſunt iterum mortui: Chriſtus autem reſurgens ex mortuis, jam non moritur*, Rom.6.9.

3. And

3. And therefore *Christs resurrection was* (as Aquinas saith, and as it is indeed) *the beginning of the future resurrection.* Then must they needs die again who were raised before him. He was the first Guide that lead the way to the eternall resurrection. *He abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light*, 2. Tim. 1. 10. Life and immortalitie to light, which were before in darknesse. And I think that the Apostle may well be thus paraphrased in that place to the Hebrews: *The women desired that their dead children might be raised again,* (1.King.17.18. 2.King.4.22,&c.) *and, as a gift they received their dead raised to life again, to live with them according to their desire. But others were tortured, and would not accept deliverance, and cared not for the joyes of this life, or the punishment unto death, nor temporary raising, that they might obtain the better resurrection: not to die again, as the others did; but to live for evermore.*

4 But as for the third, Tostatus saith, *He lived a long time, and he was more healthie then he was before he died:* And he giveth this sound reason; *Because what things are done supernaturally, are farre more perfect then they that are done naturally.* Never was there so good wine, as the water turned into wine: the choicenesse whereof was so easily discerned, even when the palate was cloyed, when the taste was corrupted and dull'd, towards the end of a feast, Joh.2.10. Now as he lived a long time, so out of doubt in the end he died, tasting of mortalitie as truely as the Prophet did, whose bones before had raised him.

O Blessed Jesu, I beg not at thy hands the reuniting of my soul unto my body, for a temporary life: but, if it be thy holy will, let the vertue of thy Passion raise me first, from the death of sinne, to the life of righteousnesse; and from a righteous temporary life, to the life of immortall happinesse. Grant this, for thy glorious Names sake, O holy Redeemer. Amen.

CHAP. III.

1. *Whileſt Chriſt lived, none raiſed any dead ſave himſelf onely.*
2. *The Rulers daughter raiſed by Chriſt, died again.*
3. *So did the young man whom Chriſt recalled to life.*
4. *Many miracles in that miracle of Lazarus his reſurrection.*
5. *Chriſt gave perfect health to thoſe, whom he healed or raiſed.*
6. *Lazarus his holy life, and his ſecond death.*

1. THe next place of my diviſion leadeth me to treat of thoſe whom Chriſt himſelf raiſed. For if Chriſt did give authoritie to his twelve Apoſtles *to raiſe the dead*, Matth. 10. 8. though *both in the old Interpreter and Theophylact theſe words are wanting*, ſaith Beza: yet did they not, or the Seventie, at their return to him, ſay they had raiſed any, (which he himſelf did ſo ſparingly) though *they healed the ſick*, Mark 6. 13. and *the devils were ſubject unto them through his name*, Luk. 10. 17. Neither did the Baptiſt, nor any in Chriſts life-time raiſe up any, ſo farre as can be gathered. It was a work he appropriated to his own power, for the act thereof, whileſt he lived; and which he maketh to be an infallible token and proof that he was the Meſſiah; as appeareth by the anſwer of the ambaſſage which Chriſt returned to the Baptiſt, Luk. 7. 22. *The dead are raiſed* by me, or by my power: Therefore I am he that ſhould come. For that is one member of his argument. And indeed (perhaps) he raiſed divers, whom the Scripture hath not particularized: for *he did very many things that are not written*, Joh. 21. 25. Yea, *many ſignes truely did he in the preſence of his diſciples, which are not written in this book*, Joh. 20. 30. and his Apoſtles after his death did actuate that power, which habitually in his life they received.

2. But thoſe that are mentioned to be raiſed by Chriſt, whileſt he lived on earth, are likewiſe three:

1. A Rulers daughter, Matth. 9. 25.
2. A dead man, the onely ſonne of his mother, Luk. 7. 15.
3. Lazarus, his friend, Joh. 11. 44.

And all theſe returned to do their offices, and follow their vocations in this life; and in the end payed their due to nature, and died again.

In

In the firſt we obſerve, that ſhe was a damſel of twelve yeares of age; and being dead, *her ſpirit came again*, Luk.8.55. *She aroſe and walked*, Mark 5.42. and *Chriſt commanded to give her meat*, in the ſame place of Luke. And as the meat was commanded to be given her, that they might ſee ſhe was to live ſuch a life as before ſhe lived: ſo, out of doubt, the commanded meat was offered unto her, and ſhe did eat, and was ſtrengthened by it: both living and dying afterwards, as other maids and men did, and no way riſing to immortall life.

3. As for the ſecond, he was a young man, on whoſe mother *Chriſt had compaſſion*, Luk.7.13. She was a widow, the youth her onely ſonne: and when Chriſt touch'd but the coffin, and ſaid, *Young man ariſe*; (that you may ſee both his vertue and his voice had a piercing and quickning power) *he that was dead ſat up, and began to ſpeak; and Chriſt delivered him to his mother*, verſ.15. Now, theſe are evident ſignes of a naturall life in a naturall body, which muſt yeeld in the end to the ſtroke of death. And the raiſing of this young man being bruited abroad, was the eſpeciall motive why the Baptiſt ſent two diſciples with a meſſage unto Chriſt, Luk.7.17, &c.

4. The third whom Chriſt raiſed was Lazarus, who had been buried foure dayes ere Chriſt came unto him, Joh.11.17. (that I may paſſe over the uncertain time from his death to his buriall) [d] *Stinking after foure dayes entering*, ſaith S. Auguſtine: Yet when *Jeſus cried with a loud voice, Lazarus come forth; he that was dead came forth bound hand and foot with grave-clothes, and his face was bound about with a napkin: and Jeſus ſaith unto them, Looſe him, and let him go*, Joh.11.44. In which miracle I finde foure or five wrapped up and involved: That ſo ſuddenly his ſoul did come from its abode: That the ſtinking ill-organized body was ſo ſoon, ſo well prepared: That the ſoul was ſo quickly united; and no ſooner united, then exerciſing her faculties on the bodie, which yeelded ſuch ready obedience: That he could ſee the way out of the grave (and, perchance, approach towards our Saviour) when his eyes were blinded: That he was able to go and walk before he was looſed by them, while his hands and his feet were bound with grave-clothes. Yet that the miracle aimed not to raiſe him to an immortall life, appeareth, becauſe he did not onely go from his grave to Bethanie, to the houſe where his ſiſters, Mary and Martha were; but becauſe he ſupped with our Saviour; he being *one of them that ſat at the table with Jeſus*, Joh.12.2. where, out of doubt, he did eat as the reſt did.

There is an argument yet left, as undeniable, as unanſwerable. That the then living did think Lazarus lived to die again: For, *the chief Prieſts conſulted that they might put Lazarus to death*, as well as Chriſt, Joh.12.10. which they would not,

[d] *Fœtens, & quatriduanus.*

not, they could not have done, if he had not lived, and could not die like other men; if he had been raiſed to life immortall: and they knew he was once raiſed, Joh. 11.45,47.

5. Concerning the ſick that were healed, and the dead raiſed by Chriſt, worthy Writers further agree, that Chriſt did *integram corporis ſanitatem conferre, omni infirmitate rejectâ, Left no reliques of ſickneſſe or infirmity when he healed.* Chriſt never healed any one man twice, Joh. 7. 23. Ὅλον ἄνθρωπον ὑγιῆ ἐποίησα, *Totum hominem ſanum feci, I made a man every whit whole; Healed a man wholly,* ſay the Rhemiſts. Perhaps I may adde, that Chriſt never healed the body of any, but he healed his ſoul likewiſe, at leaſt for the inſtant time. I am ſure Chryſoſtom, Auguſtine, and Beda to this purpoſe ſay, The ſame man was healed by Chriſt, Joh. 5. 14. *Qui foris ab infirmitate, ipſe etiam intus ſalvavit à ſcelere:* He ſaved the man from outward infirmitie and inward ſinne: He healed (as I may comment on the words) his body at the pool of Bethesda, his ſoul in the Temple. Chriſt himſelf ſaid, *Totum hominem ſanum feci, I have healed the whole man:* and Beza on Joh. 7. 23 ſaith, *He was healed both ſoul and body: Corporaliter & ſpiritualiter, Both bodily and ghoſtly,* ſaith Hugo Cardinalis. Even he, who was impotent, and had an infirmity thirty eight yeares, upon Chriſts command *immediately was made whole, and took up his bed and walked,* Joh. 5. 9. *and immediately,* upon Chriſts word, *the blinde received his ſight,* Mark 10. 52. the deaf and ill-ſpeaking man, after Chriſt had ſaid, Ephphatha, *his eares were ſtraightway opened, and the ſtring of his tongue was looſed, and he ſpake plain,* Mark 7. 35. *The fever immediately left Simons wives mother, after Chriſt took her by the hand, and lift her up: and ſhe miniſtred unto them,* Mark 1.31. Chriſt left no relique of any old diſeaſe, and whom he healed of any one infirmitie, we never read that he complained of any other. So though Lazarus before his death, was ἀσθενῶν, *Languens, longâ infirmitate fractus, actu ægrotus, Pining, feeble, ſick,* ſaith Salmeron: yet was he immediately and perfectly cured: and (as I imagine) he was upon his reſuſcitation, not onely *in latitudine ſanitatis, Void of all weakneſſe*; ſo that no part was ſick or miſ-affected by any dyſcraſie: but *in perfectione ſalutis, In full compleat health*; and had obtained by Chriſt, ὁλοκληρίαν, *The height and fulneſſe of health; a conſtant, ſetled, habituall ſoundneſſe in each part of his body.* For as art is but the ape of nature, and naturall things are farre more abſolute and perfect then artificiall: ſo things miraculous as much exceed things naturall in perfection. So that no naturall *craſis*, no temper or temperature, no health is ſo pure and exact, as that which is wrought immediately by a divine finger: In the vigour and ſtrength whereof Lazarus might have lived, as Adam and Eve did, a long time.

6. What

6. What do I ſpeak of likelihoods, or poſſibilities, when we have good Authours which give us more light concerning Lazarus his life, and concerning his death? *There is a manuſcript of the Engliſh hiſtorie in the Vatican at Rome, teſtifying, That about the* 35 *yeare of Chriſt* (ſaith Baronius on the ſame yeare) *Lazarus, Marie Magdalene, and Martha, with Marcella their waiting-woman, with Maximinus their diſciple, with Joſeph of Arimathea their companion,* [e] *were put into a little ſciph, or great boat, without oares or fit tackling, and ſo were in great danger at the ſea: but by Gods providence,* [f] *they arrived at Marſillis, a citie of Provance in France.* Toſtatus upon 1. King. 17. ſaith, *Lazarus was a Biſhop, and an holy Martyr.* Epiphanius in the catalogue of Manichæus his aſſertions, ſaith he hath it by tradition, that *Lazarus was thirty yeares old when he was raiſed up, and that he lived afterward other thirty yeares.* See the ſame Epiphanius, *Hæreſ.*66. Gregory the great, *Dialog. lib.*4. 28. addeth, that *Lazarus never laught after he was raiſed, and he did ſo tame himſelf with faſtings, watchings, and labours, that his very converſation did ſeem to ſpeak,* (*though he held his tongue*) *that he had ſeen the infernall torments.* So farre Gregorie. Yet, under his correction, he might as well, and as much bring his bodie under, and flee from the verie inclination to ſinne, becauſe he had taſted of the joyes celeſtiall, and peace unconceiveable. Thus have you the life and death of Lazarus.

[e] *Imponebantur navi, abſq; remigio.*

[f] *Maſſiliam appulerunt.*

O Thou who art the Reſurrection and the Life, quicken me with thy Spirit, lead me by thy grace, and crown me with thy glory, for thy tender mercy, O my ſweet Saviour, my joy and delight, the life of my ſoul, my Mediatour and Advocate, Jeſu Chriſt. Amen.

CHAP. IIII.

1. *Tabitha died again.*
2. *So did Eutychus.*
3. *They who were raiſed about the Paſsion of Chriſt, died not again, as many ancient and late Writers do imagine.* M^r. Montague *is more reſerved.*

1. NOw am I come to ſpeak of thoſe, who after Chriſts aſcenſion were raiſed. For though in his life time, none of Chriſts inwardeſt diſciples or friends raiſed any; (as Eliſha's ſervant could not raiſe the Shunammites ſonne, but Eliſha himſelf muſt do it, and did it, 2. King. 4. 31, &c. And Eliſha

ſha himſelf raiſed none, while his maſter Elijah lived, but Elijah himſelf did it, 1. King. 17.22.) yet after Chriſts aſcenſion, by his power communicated to them, *the beleever ſhall do the works that I do, and greater works then theſe ſhall he do*, ſaith Chriſt, Joh.14.12. One was raiſed by S. Peter, an other by S. Paul. You ſhall finde the firſt, Act.9.40. When Peter had *kneeled and prayed, and turned him to Tabitha her body*, and *ſaid, Tabitha, ariſe; ſhe opened her eyes, and when ſhe ſaw Peter, ſhe ſat up*. Yet was ſhe dead before, and waſht, and laid in an upper chamber, verſ.37.

2. And for the other, the ſtorie is this, Act. 20.9. *As Paul was long preaching, Eutychus ſunk down with ſleep, and fell down from the third loft, and was taken up dead:* perchance broken in ſome parts of his bodie; bruiſed certainly: him S. Paul raiſed, and *they brought the young man alive, and were not a little comforted*, verſ.12. Of theſe two, as well as of the reſt, there is no doubt but that they lived again, again to die. So thinks Aquinas, *3.part. Summ. Quæſt.53. Artic.3.* and the whole School (following him) agree with us in this. So Suarez, Lorinus, who not? Take one of the ancients for all: Cyprian reckoneth up thoſe who were raiſed in the Old Teſtament; and others raiſed by Chriſts command; and ſaith of theſe, [h] *They lived a while, and died again:* and a little before of them in the Old Teſtament, [i] *They taſted of death the ſecond time.* And therefore it needs the leſſe proof, becauſe none denieth it: and the contrary needeth the leſſe diſproof, becauſe none hath averred it.

[h] *Aliquo tempore beneficio vitæ uſi, iterum ad funera redîere*; Pag. 523. de Reſur. Chriſti, paragr. 8.

[i] *Ad mortem quam guſtaverunt iterum redierunt.*

3. Now it is time to come to the third and laſt part of my main firſt diviſion, and to ſpeak of them who aroſe about the time that Chriſt died; for of them there is a deep and intricate queſtion: and the hiſtorie of them is ſet down at large by the Evangeliſt, Matth.27.52, and 53 verſes: *The graves were opened, and many bodies of Saints which ſlept aroſe, and came out of the graves after his reſurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many.* So farre the text. Of the various pointing of which words ſee more hereafter, opening two windows for two expoſitions. On which words, divers worthy men, both modern and ancient, conclude, That thoſe Saints died not again, [k] *But appeared to many, and, with Chriſt, never after were to die, but went into heaven*, ſaith Jacobus Faber Stapulenſis. And M^r. Beza on this place opineth, that they did not riſe, that again they might live among men, and die as Lazarus and others did: but that they might accompany Chriſt, by whoſe power they roſe, into eternall life. *The late Writers* (ſaith Maldonate) *think, that they went into heaven with Chriſt:* and with them doth himſelf agree. So Pineda on Job 19. 25. So Suarez a third Jeſuit. So Anſelm.

[k] *Sed apparuerunt multis, & etiam cum Chriſto, nunquam ultrà morituri, abierunt in cœlum.*

So

So Aquinas on the place, and on the Sentences. So (if Suarez cite them truely) Origen in the first book to the Romanes, about those words of the first chapter, *By the resurrection of Jesus our Lord:* and Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom. 6.* and Justinus, Quæst. 85. Ambrose in his Enarration on the first Psalme; and Eusebius, Demonst. 4. 12. and of modern Authours, and of our Church, Bishop Bilson in the effect of his Sermons touching the full redemption of mankinde by the death and bloud of Jesus Christ, pag. 217. So Baronius *ad annum Christi* 48. *num.* 24. concerning those Saints whom Christ piercing the heavens carried with himself on high, leading captivitie captive, Ephes. 4. 8. More reserved and moderate is Mr. Montague, that indefatigable Student, sometime my chamber-fellow, and President in the Kings Colledge in Cambridge, now the Reverend Lord Bishop of Chichester, who in his answer to the Gag of the Protestants, pag. 209. saith of these Saints, *They were Saints, indeed deceased, but restored to life, and peradventure unto eternall life, in bodies as well as souls.*

Most cleare Fountain of Wisdome inexhaustible, wash, I beseech thee, the spots of my soul, and in the midst of many puddles of errour, cleanse my understanding, that I may know and embrace the truth through Jesus Christ. Amen.

CHAP. V.

1. *Who were supposed to be the Saints which were raised, by such as maintain that they accompanied Christ into heaven.*

2. *A strange storie out of the Gospel of the Nazarens.*

3. *Adams soul was saved. Adams bodie was raised about Christs Passion, saith Pineda out of diverse Fathers: Thus farre Pineda hath truth by him. That the sepulchre of Adam was on mount Calvarie: so say Athanasius, Origen, Cyprian, Ambrose, Basil, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Augustine, Euthymius, Anastasius Sinaita, Germanus Patriarch of Constantinople.*

4. *It was applauded in the Church in Hieromes time.*

5. *Theophylact thought Adam buried in Calvarie. Drusius unadvisedly taxeth the Fathers. Tertullian consenteth with other Fathers, and Nonnus, who is defended against Heinsius.*

6. *At Jerusalem they now shew the place where Adam his*

his head was found. Moſes Barcepha ſaith, that Sem after the floud buried the head of Adam.

7. The Romane ſtorie of Tolus, and Capitolium, much reſembling the ſtorie of Adam.

1. TO the clearing of this cloud, and that we may carry the truth viſibly before us, I think it fit to enquire, Firſt, Who theſe Saints were which thus miraculouſly aroſe: and then ſecondly to determine, Whether their bodies were again depoſited in the earth till the reſurrection: or, Whether in their bodies with Chriſt they aſcended into heaven.

2. For the firſt, Hugo Cardinalis on Matth. 27. 53. hath an old ſtorie: *It is ſaid* (ſaith he) *in the Evangeliſme of the Nazarens, that two good and holy men, who were dead before about fourty yeares, came into the Temple, and ſaying nothing, made ſignes to have pen, ink, and parchment; and wrote, That thoſe who were in Limbus rejoyced upon Chriſts deſcent, and that the devils ſorrowed.* Though the reſt be fabulous, yet herein the Goſpel of the Nazarens agreeth with our Goſpel, That the names of the raiſed are not mentioned. Others have been bold to ſet down both the names and the order of them who aroſe.

3. Auguſtine, *Epiſt. 99. ad Euodium*, thus, [a] *Almoſt the whole Church agreeth, That Chriſt deſcending into hell, freed the firſt Adam thence.* That the Church beleeved this, *non inaniter, not vainly*, but upon ſome good ground, we are to beleeve; from whence ſoever the tradition came, though there be no expreſſe Scripture. If this be true of Adams ſoul, yet is it nothing to our queſtion of his bodily reſuſcitation. Proceed we therefore to thoſe that think his very bodie was raiſed.

[a] *De illo quidem primo homine, patre generis humani, quòd eum ibidem (Chriſtus ad inferna deſcendens) ſolverit, Eccleſia ferè tota conſentit.*

Adam then aroſe, ſaith Athanaſius in his Sermon of the Paſſion and the Croſſe: ſaith Origen in his 35 Tractate on Matthew: ſaith Auguſtine, 161 queſt. on Geneſis: and others alſo, if Pineda on the fore-cited place wrong them not. And he giveth this congruentiall reaſon, That Adam, who heard the ſentence of death, ſhould preſently alſo be partaker of the reſurrection by Chriſt, and with him, who had expiated his ſinne by death. To which may be added, That (as S. Hierom reports) the Jews have a tradition, that the ramme was ſlain on mount Calvarie in ſtead of Iſaac; as alſo Auguſtine (*Serm. 71. de Tempore*) ratifieth. And to this day they ſay they have there the altar of Melchiſedech. So Athanaſius reports from the Jewiſh Doctours, that in Golgotha was the ſepulchre

chre of Adam. This is true; but it is not certain that Adam was raiſed; and not true, that he aſcended bodily into heaven.

Mr. Broughton, in his obſervations of the firſt ten Fathers, ſaith thus: *Rambam recordeth that which no reaſon can deny, how the Jews ever held by Tradition, that Adam, Abel, and Cain offered, where Abraham offered Iſaac, where both Temples were built, on which mountain Chriſt taught, and died.* And *as the place was called Calvaria, becauſe the head or skull of a man was there found, and found bare without hair, and depilated,* ſaith Baſil; *ſo divers Fathers have concluded, that Adam was there buried, and that it was his head.* See Origen, tractat. 35. on Matth. Cyprian in his ſermon on the reſurrection; Ambroſe in his tenth book of his commentaries on Luk. 23. Baſil on the fifth of Eſay; Epiphanius *contra Hareſ. lib.* 1. Chryſoſtome *Homil.* 84. *in Joannem*; Auguſtine *Serm.* 71. *de Tempore*, and *de Civitat.* 16.32. Euthymius on Matth. So Athanaſius Sinaita, *lib.* 6. *in Hexam. in Tom.* 1. *Bibliothecæ Patrum*; and Sanctus Germanus Patriarch of Conſtantinople, *in Theoria rerum Eccleſiaſt.* as you may ſee *in Tom.* 6. *Biblioth. Patrum*; beſides abundance of new writers, with whoſe names I delight not to load my page.

4 Hierom on theſe words, Epheſ. 5. 14. *Wherefore he ſaith, Awake thou that ſleepeſt, &c.* telleth, how he heard one diſputing in the Church, of this place, thus: *This teſtimonie is ſpoken to Adam buried in Calvarie, where Chriſt was crucified. Which place was called Calvarie, becauſe there was placed* Caput antiqui hominis, *Adams skull. Therefore at that time, when Chriſt, being crucified, did hang over his ſepulchre, this propheſie was accompliſhed, ſaying, Ariſe Adam, that ſleepeſt, and ſtand up from the dead; and not as we reade,* ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός, *Chriſt ſhall give thee light; but* ἐφάψεται, *Chriſt ſhall touch thee. becauſe by the touch of his bloud, and of his bodie hanging over him, he might be enlivened, and riſe.* Now though Hierom himſelf ſaith, that this ſenſe agreeth not with the context; yet he leaves it to the Reader to judge, whether the thing be true, or no; and confeſſeth, that the words were pleaſingly entertained by the people, and [b] *approved with applauſe extraordinary both of hand and foot.* And [c] Epiphanius expreſly affirmeth, that Adam was buried in Calvarie, and that the mountain was ſo called from Adams head there found; adding, [d] *Where our crucified Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by water and bloud which flowed from his pierced ſide, figuratively ſhewed our ſalvation from the primitive lump, whileſt auſpiciouſly he ſprinkled the reliques of the firſt man.*— Therefore, *Now was fulfilled,* ſaith he, *Surge qui dormis, Ariſe thou that ſleepeſt, &c.* Ambroſe and Paulinus ſeem to have read it ἐφάψεται, and

[b] *Quodam plauſu & tripudio ſunt accepta.*
[c] *Hæreſ.* 46. *contra Tatian. in fine.*
[d] *In quo crucifixus Dominus noſter Jeſus Chriſtus, per aquam & ſanguinem, qui fluxit ab ipſo, per compunctum ipſius latus, in ænigmate oſtendit ſalutem noſtram ab initio maſſæ, primi hominis reliquias reſpergere auſpicatus.*

Auguſtine on theſe words, Pſal. 3. 5. *The Lord ſuſtained me*, citeth this place thus: [e] *Ariſe who ſleepeſt, and ſtand up from the dead, and Chriſt ſhall touch thee:* which reading was uſed alſo by others in Hieromes time.

[e] *Surge qui dormis, & exurge à mortuis, & continget te Chriſtus.*

5. Theophylact on Matth. thus: *They that hold Traditions, ſay, Adam was buried in Calvarie. It is a Tradition* (ſaith he, on Mark) *from the ancient Fathers:* adding this, *Therefore Chriſt, who healed the fault and death of Adam, was there buried; that where was the beginning, there ſhould be the end, and deſtruction of death.* On Luke he alledgeth this reaſon, [f] *Where the fall was by the tree, there by the tree alſo ſhould be the riſing again.* Now as this reaſon is but weak, ſo his words on John are worthie remembrance: *That the Tradition is Eccleſiaſticall, not Judaicall; that it was publiſhed by Noah after the floud.* Whence we may juſtly tax Druſius in his firſt commentarie *ad voces novi Teſtamenti*, on the word *Golgotha*, who aſcribeth the finding of Adams skull, and his buriall on Golgotha, to the too much credulitie of the Fathers, in beleeving the Jews. It rather makes againſt the Jews, and the Jews gain nothing (in my opinion) by that report. Certain old verſes fathered on Tertullian, prove directly, that in the ſame place that Adam died Chriſt died alſo; and of Golgotha, and Calvaria in particular, thus runne the verſes,

[f] *Ubi per lignum caſus, illic per lignum & reſurrectio.*

Hîc hominem primum ſuſcepimus eſſe ſepultum;
Hîc patitur Chriſtus: ſic ſanguine terra madeſcit,
Pulvis Adæ ut veteris poſsit cum ſanguine Chriſti
Commiſtus, ſtillantis aquæ virtute lavari.

The firſt man here, they ſay, was buried;
The earth was here with Chriſts bloud watered:
That Adams duſt commixt with Chriſt his bloud,
Might ſo be bath'd as in a ſoveraigne floud.

Tertullians Latine verſes may be ſeconded with Nonnus his Greek verſes on John 19. 17.

Ἐισόκε χῶρον ἵκανε φατιζομένοιο κρανίης,
Ἀδὰμ πρωτογόνοιο φερώνυμον ἄντυγι κόρσης.

Which are thus tranſlated,

Donec in locum venit nominati cranii,
Adam priſci nomen ferentem ambitu capitis.

Untill he came toth' place (as goes the fame)
Which from old Adams skull did take its name.

Where Nonnus concludeth, (as many other more ancient did before him) that it was called *the place of a skull*, from the firſt Adams head. The learned Heinſius (*Exercit. ſacr. pag.* 196.) contradicting ſaith, *The Evangeliſt did not think the place was ſo called from Adams skull, nor that the word* SKULL *inclines to that ſenſe: nor is it called* ADAMS

SKULL,

SKULL, *but* THE PLACE OF A SKULL. — *And whereas Epiphanius ſaith, that Adams skull was found in that place, (which gave occaſion to the words of Nonnus) I marvell that they who were converſant in books of the Helleniſts, found not the beginning of that fable. For in them, the word* ADAM *is taken* Collective, *after the Hebrew manner. So in the Latine,* 1. *Sam.* 7. 9. [g] *Iſta eſt lex Adam, hoc eſt,* τῶν ἀνθρώπων, *not* τῦ Ἀδάμ. *Moreover, Symmachus interpreteth* τὸ Ἀδὰμ, ἀνθρωπότητα, *Humane nature. So where Joſiah* (2. *King.* 23. 20.) *is ſaid* combuſſiſſe oſſa אדם, *to have burnt the bones of Adam, the Seventie have it,* κατέκαυσεν ὀστᾶ ἀνθρώπων ἐπ' αὐτῷ, *He burnt the bones of men on it. Becauſe therefore in this place were the ſkuls of Adam, that is, of men, the place is called ſo. And whereas* A D A M *ſhould be taken for* M E N, *Nonnus by ſigning out the firſt Adam hath increaſed the abſurditie of this errour.* To this effect Heinſius on that place. In this my defence of Nonnus, I give but a touch at the ſlip ἐπ' αὐτῷ, which the Septuagint have ἐπ' αὐτά, anſwerable to the Hebrew; & at the other ſlip of citing 1. Sam. 7. 9. in ſtead of 2. Sam. 7. 19. and, granting that τὸ Ἀδὰμ is taken ſometimes *Collectivè* both in Scriptures and ſome Helleniſts, do deſire to know how it is applied to this place. For, though there be mention of Adam in Nonnus, yet there is none in the Text; which might give the hint to the *errour* of Nonnus, as Heinſius miſtermeth it. And when Heinſius produceth one Helleniſt expounding Golgotha, and there uſing τὸ Ἀδὰμ *Collectivè*, he ſhall ſay ſomething. But ſaith the worthy Heinſius, it is not called *Cranium Adami, The ſkull of Adam*; but Κρανίε τόπος, *The place of a ſkull.* I anſwer, Neither are the words *Crania Adam, The ſkulls of men*, as Heinſius underſtandeth it. For Luke 23. 33. it is ſaid expreſly, *The place* is *called* Κρανίον· the other three Evangeliſts have it alſo, all and every of them, in the ſingular number, Κρανίε τόπος. *To the place Golgotha, which is, being interpreted, the place of a ſkull,* Mark 15. 22. *Called Golgotha, that is to ſay, a place of a ſkull,* as it is Matth. 27. 33. or as it is varied by S. John, *He went forth into a place called the place of a ſkull, which is called in the Hebrew, Golgotha,* John 19. 17. *Even in the Hebrew,* [*] *GOLGOTHA is a Syriack word, not an Hebrew one*, ſaith Hierom on the word, in his expoſition of the Hebrew names, uſed by S. Matthew. He is ſeconded by [h] Bellarmine, who is confident, that the vulgar tongue, ſpoken, and written in the Apoſtles dayes, was the Syriack, and not the pure and ſacred Hebrew; inſtancing in *Golgotha*. The truth is, though the termination be Syriack, yet it is an Hebrew word of the radix גלל, *Circuire, To compaſſe:* from whence comes GALGAL, *Sphæra, An orb,* and GULGULETH, or GOLGOLETH (which the Caldeans and Syrians expreſſe by addition of Aleph) *Caput, ob ejus rotunditatem, An head, for its roundneſſe.* Mercer and Cevallerius adde

[g] The words are in 2. Sam 7. 19. *This is the law of men*, ſaith Heinſius, *not of Adam.* Our tranſlation hath it, *This is the manner of man*, without reſtraining it to the firſt Adam.

[*] GOLGOTHA *Syrum eſt, non Hebræum.*

[h] *De verbo Dei* 2. 4.

adde in the Italick letters, *The skull is properly ſo called:* [i] *Part is taken for the whole; and not for the whole bodie onely, but for the whole man: as when after the Latine guiſe, we ſay, By the heads;* meaning, *By the people.* So alſo in the common proverb, [k] *So many heads* (that is, *men*) *ſo many mindes.* From *Golgoleth* cometh *Golgoltha,* or *Golgotha,* the letter ך being taken away by Syncope, [l] *As was then uſuall,* ſaith Druſius: yea, and [m] *for a ſweet and pleaſant ſound ſake,* ſaith Lucas Brugenſis. For as the Syriack omits the firſt ך, reading it *Gogultha,* or, according to Druſius, *Gagultha;* (though Mercer and Cevallerius ſay it is *Golgolta* in the Syriack tongue) ſo the Greek and the Latine leave out the ſecond ך, and reade it *Golgotha.* Now ſince none of the Evangeliſts have the exact Syriack word, and S. John ſaith, *The place is called Golgotha in Hebrew;* let Golgotha paſſe, not for a Syriack, but an Hebrew word, eſpecially ſince the Syrians have an other word, by which they ſignifie a skull, viz. *Karkaphto*; and let us come up cloſe to Heinſius.

If he could prove, that *Cranion, a skull* (being the word which all the Evangeliſts inſiſt upon) is taken *collectivé,* for many skuls, in the Hebrew, Syriack, or by the Helleniſts; if one skull could belong to many men; I would ſay his proof were ſharp, and pointed: but ſince it is harſh to conceive, or to write, or ſay (not *the places,* but *the place;* not *of skulls,* but *of a skull*) *the place of a skull of men* (it being a very Soleciſm in the Hebrew, and the Syriack, in the Greek, whether ſacred or profane, and indeed in all languages) I muſt take libertie to ſay, Heinſius his argument is too weak and blunt, to hurt Nonnus; though we adde this his other exception, [n] *The place was called a skull, becauſe mens skuls were there.* I anſwer, Though many were there buried, and many other skulls were there extant; (as in other *Polyandriis,* or Oſſaries, Church-yards, or Charnell-houſes) yet ſince Adam was there buried alſo, how followeth it, that the place was called ſo from the ignoble many, rather then from the firſt Adam.

To ſpeak truely, Golgotha was not an ordinarie dormitorie; there were no caves for buriall, there were no places of ſepulchres. All malefactours, even amongſt them at that time, were not there executed; onely ſome, for ſome offences: and all that there were executed, were not there interred; but ſome were removed to their private buriall-places. If from the multitude there congeſted, the place had its denomination; the three Evangeliſts (who have it τόπος κρανίου, *The place of a skull*) might moſt eaſily, and, in likelihood, one of them would have varied it τόπος κρανίων, *The place of skulls:* but becauſe the Scripture is expreſſe, it was one ſingle skull, from which the place was ſo called; and conſtant Tradition hath delivered, that Adam was there buried; and divers Ancients, beſides Epiphanius, have both beleeved, and written,

[i] *Pars pro toto, imò & pro toto homine dicitur, ut cùm Latinè dicimus,* Per capita.
[k] *Quot capita tot ſententiæ.*
[l] *Ex conſuetudine illius temporis.*
[m] *Euphoniæ gratiâ.*
[n] *Quia in iſto loco crania fuerunt Adam, hoc eſt τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ità dictus eſt locus.*

written, that Adams skull was there found; Nonnus had reaſon, in his paraphraſe, to apply the Text unto Adam: neither is it a fable, errour, or abſurditie. The Scripture ſaith, *The place of a skull*; Nonnus ſaith, with Antiquitie, *The place of Adams skull*; Heinſius ſaith, *It was called Golgotha, or the place of a skull, from the skuls of many men there buried.* Who hath moſt likelihood? Nonnus, or Heinſius?

6. Mr George Sands, in the relation of his journey, pag. 163. reporteth, that *on the left ſide of an altar, in mount Calvarie, there is a clift in the rock, in the which they ſay, that the head of Adam was found, and (as they will have it) there buried, (others ſay in Hebron) that his bones might be ſprinkled with the reall bloud of our Saviour; which he knew ſhould be ſhed in that place, by a propheticall fore-knowledge.* And in the next page, he picturing out the chappels, and ſeverall monuments, hath honoured that clift, where they ſay the head of Adam was found, with a locall delineation.

Now becauſe it may be thought, that the floud did overthrow ſepulchres, houſes, and monuments, and Adams among the reſt; Moſes Barcepha, in his book *de Paradiſo*, excellently ſecondeth Theophylact, and ſaith, That Noah, fore-knowing the floud, took into the ark with him, the bones of Adam; *And (having tripartitely divided the world unto his three ſonnes*, ſaith Epiphanius *in Anchorato*, neare the end; *all Aſia even to Egypt, unto Sem; Africa unto Cham; Europe to Japheth) he gave to Sem, the head or skull of Adam, who, burying it in the old grave, called the place Calvaria.*

Not farre from the beginning of the firſt book *Oraculorum Sibyllinorum*, Sibylla Babylonica ſaith, She was with her husband in the ark, at the generall undage, or cataclyſme, which ſome do thus expound; that by *Sibylla*, is meant the *Kabala*; which is nothing els, but the conſtant belief, and knowledge of the Fathers, delivered by Tradition: ſo *Kabala*, or *Sibylla* might be in the ark at the univerſall inundation, and, in a ſort, may be ſaid to be married to Noah, or to Sem, with whom there remained (out of doubt) the moſt certain agraphall Traditions: and among thoſe, this might be one, of the grave of Adam, and his head there, after the floud, buried. See Baronius *ad Annum Chriſti* 34. *numero* 112. *& ſequent.* Laſtly, S. Hierome is fully and exactly for us, *Epiſt.* 17 *ad Marcellum.*

7. The Romanes have a ſtorie ſomewhat reſembling this. Suffer a digreſſion not unworthy your reading.

In Rome there was an hill, called firſt, *Mons Saturninus, from Saturn who dwelt there*, ſaith Terentius Varro, Dionyſius, and Feſtus. Afterwards

A duce Tarpeio mons eſt cognomen adeptus,

ſaith Propertius, *lib.* 4. *ante medium:* and was called *Mons Tarpeius,*

peius, from Tarpeia, a traiterous maid there killed, and (as it were) buried under the ſpoils. See Plinie, *lib.* 19. 1. Propertius there intimateth, that ſhe expected marriage with Tatius, and ſpecializeth his reply in diſdain,

Nube, ait, & regni ſcande cubile mei.
Dixit, & ingeſtis comitum ſuperobruit armis.
Hæc, virgo, officiis, dos erat apta tuis.
Whilſt ſhe both wife and Queen did look to be,
He ſmothered her with armour thrown upon her:
And ſaid, Virgin, this dowrie fitteth thee,
Being for thy ill offices the meeteſt honour.

But Livie, confeſſing that by their armour ſhe was ſmothered, reporteth two different relations. Firſt, that ſhe compounding with them to have what they wore on their left arms, (which were, according to the preſent faſhion, bracelets of pure gold) they thought their promiſe quitted, by throwing to her, and on her, their targets. Others ſecondly ſay, ſhe demanded their principall armour of defence, and thereupon ſuſpecting that her intent was to deceive, they payed her in her own kinde, and by them killed her.

Thirdly, upon this accident it received its ſurname of *Mons Capitolinus*: Ludovicus Vives, on Auguſtine *de Civit.* 4. 10. citeth Dionyſius ſaying that it was called CAPITOLINUS, *Ab humano capite in fundamentis reperto, From a mans head found in the foundation of it*. Livius, towards the end of his firſt book, ſaith, That in the foundation of the temple there appeared a mans head, and his whole face ſound and uncorrupt. Arnobius, *contra Gentes lib.* 6. almoſt in the beginning, inſtructeth us at large, whoſe head this was: and from the ancient authorities of Sammonicus, Granius, Valerianus, and Fabius, declareth to the Romanes themſelves, as well as to the other Gentiles, That there was one Tolus, ſlain by his brothers ſervant: that his head was cut off, and carefully hid for good lucks ſake: that his grave or ſepulchre was the Capitol: that the compoſition of the name, made the thing to be known: and that the citie of Rome, being to dedicate and name the temple, was not aſhamed to call it, *ex Toli capite*, CAPITOLIUM; rather then after Jupiters own name. And perhaps, upon a relation of the head found on mount Calvarie, Adrian might cauſe Jeruſalem to be called not onely *Ælia-Adria*, but alſo *Capitolina*, with reference to their hill and the head there buried alſo.

O Righteous Saviour, which didſt ſhed thy moſt precious bloud on the Croſſe, to purifie thy Church; let one drop of thy bloud diſtill upon my ſoul; that it may be preſented blameleſſe at the Throne of Grace, and avoid the ſecond death, which, without thee, is due unto me. Grant this (I humbly beſeech thee) for thine own Merit and Mercy. Amen.

CHAP. VI.

1. *Hierom ſaith, Adam was not buried on mount Calvarie. Both Hierom, Andrichomius, and Zimenes ſay, he was buried in Hebron. Hierom cenſured, for doubling in this point, by Bellarmine.*

2. *Hieroms arguments anſwered.*

3. *The Original defended againſt Hierom in Joſh.* 14. 15. ADAM *there is not a proper name, but an appellative.* Arba *is there a proper name of a man. Adrichomius erreth in* Kiriath-Arbee; *and the words ſignifie not* Civitas quatuor virorum, The citie of foure men. *New expoſitions of* Kiriath-Arbee.

4. *It may ſignifie as well* Civitas quatuor rerum, The citie of foure things: *as,* Quatuor hominum, Of foure men. *The memorable monuments about Hebron.*

5. *It may be interpreted* Civitas quadrata, quadrilatera, quadrimembris, quadricollis; A citie foureſquare, of foure ſides, of foure parts, of foure hills.

6. *If* Kiriath-Arba *doth ſignifie the citie of foure men, yet they might be other men, beſides the foure Patriarchs.*

7. *If it had its denomination from foure Patriarchs, and from their buriall there, yet Adam is none of them.*

8. *Auguſtine peremptory for Adams buriall in Calvarie; and Paula and Euſtochium, or rather Hierom.*

9. *An other objection anſwered. The Jews never ſhewed extraordinary honour to Adam, or Noah; but to Abraham, and others after him. Druſius preferreth the reading uſed by our late Tranſlation, Hoſ.* 6. 7. *before the Genevean and Tremellian.*

1. IN the other ſide, and for the contrary opinion, the ſame Hierom, on Matth. 27. 33. ſaith, *Calvaria ſignifieth not the ſepulchre of the firſt man (Adam) but the place of thoſe that were beheaded.* Secondly, *Adam was buried by Hebron, and Arbee,* ſaith Hierom. Thirdly, the accurate Adrichomius, *in verbo* HEBRON, *pag.* 49. ſaith, *Hebron or Chebron was firſt called Arbee, and Mambre, and Cariath-Arbee, the citie of foure men, becauſe the foure Patriarchs, Adam, Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob there*

dwelt, and were buried. Franciſcus Zimenes Archbiſhop of Toledo, and many others accord with him. S. Hierom led them all the way; though awry: Hierom, *in lib. de locis Hebraicis*, on the word ARBOCH, thus, [a] *It is corruptly written in our copies ARBOCH; ſince in the Hebrew it is read ARBEE, that is, Foure: becauſe there the foure Patriarchs, Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob were buried, and the great Adam, as it is written in the book of Joſhua; though ſome ſuppoſe Adam to be buried in Calvarie.* The ſame Adrichomius, pag. 46. deſcribeth a double cave in the tribe of Judah; which cave, with the ground and trees, Abraham bought of the ſonnes of Heth, in which were buried Adam and Eve, Abraham and Sarah, Iſaac and Rebecca, Jacob and Leah, which *Mauſoleum* continued till the time of S. Hierom. Now this place was cloſe by Hebron; and Hebron and this ſepulchre farre from mount Calvarie; 250 *ſtadia*, or there-abouts. Laſtly, ſaith Hierom, *If any will ſtrive that Chriſt was crucified in Calvarie, that his bloud might diſtill on the tombe of Adam; I will ask him, why others, even theeves were there crucified?* The force of theſe authorities, or reaſons, is not ſuch, as to remove me from the common opinion, that Adam was buried in Golgotha. And thus I anſwer the Objections in order.

[a] *Corruptè in noſtris codicibus Arboch ſcribitur, cùm in Hebræo legatur Arbee, id eſt quatuor: eò quòd ibi quatuor Patriarchæ, Abraham, Iſaac & Jacob ſepulti ſunt, & Adam magnus, ut in Jeſu libro ſcriptum eſt; licèt cum quidam conditum in loco Calvariæ ſuſpicentur.*

Bellarmine, *de Amiſsione gratiæ, & ſtatu peccati*, 3.12. bringeth Hierom againſt Hierom, and wondreth at his doubling: and he refuteth Hieroms arguments; and produceth many ſtrange proofs, that Adam was buried in mount Calvarie. But I deſcend to the particulars.

2. The firſt is, a miſtaken imputation of S. Hierom. For who ſaith, or ever ſaid, that the word *Calvaria* ſignified the ſepulchre of the firſt man? Neither can any man primarily argue from the names of *Golgotha*, or *Calvaria*, and κρανιου τόπος, or *Calvariæ locus, The place of a skull*, that Adam was there buried: nor yet doth *Calvaria* ſignifie *locum decollatorum*, though Hierom would have it ſo. But ſince *Calvaria*, κρανίον, properly and natively, is truely tranſlated *a ſkull, the ſkull of a man*; and GOLGOTHA, *the place of a ſkull*, Matth. 27.33. not *of ſkuls*, or *beheaded men*, in the plurall number, (for it is in the ſingular, in every of the Evangeliſts) and conſtant Tradition hath delivered, that Adam was there buried; we may conclude, not from the name to Adams buriall; but from the received opinion of Adams buriall in that place, unto the name; and may ſay, with divers Fathers, more then probably, It was termed *Golgotha*, or *the place of a ſkull*, with reference to Adams buriall, or his ſkull.

3. Secondly, S. Hierom groundeth his ſecond reaſon on the ſands, and offereth violence to the place of Scripture. Thus he readeth it, Joſh. 14. 15. *Nomen Hebron antè vocaba-*

tur

tur Cariath-Arbee; Adam maximus ibi inter Enacim ſitus eſt: Hebron was before called Cariath-Arbee; The firſt Adam was there placed among the Anakims. Whence he concludeth, That Adam was buried by Hebron and Arbee, and ſo not on mount Calvarie: for they were many miles diſtant each from other.

I anſwer, that neither the Seventy nor Hebrew have, *Ibi ſitus eſt.* Secondly, what had Adam our Protoplaſt to do, or to be buried among the Anakims? Wiſer Baronius in the place above-cited, miſliking Hierom, makes the giants name in that place of Joſhua, to be Adam: and not the firſt Adam to be one of the giants, or to be buried with them. Thirdly, both Hierom and Baronius are deceived, in thinking that *Adam* in that place is a proper name; for the words may, yea muſt runne thus according to the Hebrew, and is ſeconded by our later tranſlation; *The name of Hebron before, Kirjath-Arba, who was* (or *which Arba*) *was a great man, among the Anakims.* Now it were non-ſenſe to ſay, *The name of Hebron, was the citie of foure, who was a great man among the Anakims*: and as ſenſeleſſe were it, Joſh. 15.13. to reade it, *Caleb had the citie of foure, the father of Anak:* But taking *Arba,* for the proper name of a man, and the citie ſo called of him; the ſenſe, reaſon, and truth are all apparent. *A great man, of whom the citie was ſo called,* ſaith Tremellius: *Arba was the name of a great man among the giants,* ſaith Aben Ezra: *Homo maximus,* ſaith Andrew Maſius: *The greateſt and chiefeſt among the giants,* ſaith Vatablus in his commentarie, and Emmanuel Sa in his notes on the place. This *Arba* was *the father of Anak,* Joſh. 21.11. *And the ſonnes of Anak were giants, and came of giants; and we were,* (ſay the Iſraelites) *in their and in our own ſight as graſhoppers,* Num. 13.33. And this alſo reflects an anſwer upon the third objection of Adrichomius, who though he be moſt accurate in other things, yet here he is aſleep. For though *Arbee* ſignifie *foure,* when *Arbee* is not a proper name; and *Kiriath-arbee* may be rendered, *The citie of foure;* yet it may alſo ſignifie *The citie of one Arba,* or *Arbee:* and ſo *Kiriath-Arbee* in Hebrew is no more, then *Arbepolis* in Greek; ſo called of one Arbee, who was a man, *The father of Anak,* Joſh. 21.11. as I proved before: as *Perſepolis, Adrianopolis, Conſtantinopolis, Alexandrinopolis* in India (as Appian Alexandrinus hath it in his book of the Romane warres with the Syrians) and *Alexandropolis,* a citie of Parthia, as Plinius 6. 25. varieth it. So *Magnopolis,* as Appian calleth one citie, in his book of the Romane warres with Mithridates; and *Pompeiopolis,* a citie of Cilicia: both of theſe ſo ſtyled of Pompey the great: though the latter loſt its name, and was after (at the beſt of the empire, and at its greateſt growth) called TRAJANOPOLIS, *becauſe Trajan died there,* ſaith Solinus. So *Claudiopolis,* a citie of Cappadocia, Plin. 5.24. and *Philippipolis,* a citie in Arabia, ſo

ſo called of Philip the Emperour. All theſe cities, & many other (if it were worth the labour to recite them) had their denomination from men: likewiſe might *Arbepolis* be the citie of Arba. But why do I ſtand on *potentialls*, or *may-bees*, when Joſhua at the chap. 15. 13. calleth it τὴν πόλιν Ἀρβέ, as the Septuagint tranſlates it? and Joſh. 20.7. τὴν πόλιν Ἀρβόκ, where it is in the Hebrew, *Arba*. Sara died ἐν τῇ πόλει Ἀρβώκ, Geneſ.23.2. *The citie of Arbock:* where both Hebrew and Engliſh have *Kiriath-Arba*; and the Vulgat, *In civitate Arbæ*, which is impoſſible to be rendred *The citie of foure*, in reference to the foure Patriarchs buriall: for both Abraham and Iſaac were not buried, but alive then, and Jacob was not as yet born: yea the citie of Arba is called μητρόπολις, Joſh.14.15. *And they gave them* τὴν Καριαθαρβῶκ μητρόπολιν, Joſh.21.11.ſhe being the mother-citie; and therefore the villages about Kariath-Arbee, are called *her daughters*, Neh. 11.25.

4. Secondly, let us grant *ex ſuperabundanti*, *More then we need*, that it is to be expounded in this place, *Civitas quatuor*, *The citie of foure*; yet it may be called the citie of foure memorable things that were there: as *Kiriath-jearim*, Joſh. 15. 60. or *Kariath-jarim*, as Adrichomius reades it, is, *urbs ſylvarum*, *a citie of woods*; for ſo he expounds it pag. 22. and *Cariath-ſepher*, Joſh. 15. 15. *that is*, (ſaith he on that word *Dabir*, pag. 133.) [b] *A citie of learning*, *an Univerſitie of Paleſtine*. And he addeth, *It was* [c] *A ſtrong and royall citie given to the prieſts*. The name of KARIATH-JARIM, *ſignifieth a citie of woods*, ſaith Maſius, on Joſh. 9. 17. and KARIATH-SEPHER *is* [d] *A citie of Records, or Libraries: and ſo called, in all probabilitie*, ſaith the ſaid Maſius, on Joſh. 15. 15. See his conjectures on the place. Yea, the other name of *Kariath-ſepher*, to wit, *Kariath-ſenna*, is either ſo called, *à ſpinis*, *from the thorns* (which may grow among the woods) as moſt do think; or *if the letter* ס *was ſet for* ש, *then the word hath reference to the diſputations of learned men, as it is Deuter. 6.* 7. ſaith Maſius. And the Seventy render it, in both places, πόλιν γραμμάτων, *The citie of writings or letters*. Howſoever, as one of the cities was ſo called from the woods, or thorns; the other, from the Academie there flouriſhing, or from the monuments and records there kept, as Maſius would have it: So might *Kariath-Arbee* be ſo named, from ſome other foure eminent things. For many excellent monuments, moſt famous in their kindes, were thereabouts: from ſome foure of which it might be named *Kiriath-Arbee*, *Civitas quatuor rerum*, *The citie of foure things*. The firſt was the Altar that Abram built there, Geneſ. 13. 18. Which perchance made Abſalom feigne a vow, to ſacrifice in Hebron, at the altar of Abram, 2. Sam. 15.8. So the Seventy and Vatablus expound it. The ſecond may be that famous tree, which ſome call *Ilex*, *An holm:* others *Quercus*, *An oak*, which is favoured by the Originall,

Gen.

[b] *Civitas literarum dicta, ſeu Univerſitas & Academia Paleſtinæ.*
[c] *Valida & regia urbs data ſacerdotibus.*
[d] *Literarum vel librorum urbs.*

Gen. 18. 1. and 8. verſ. Hierom, *Terebinthus, The Turpentine tree: Under which*, ſaith Adrichomius, *Abraham miniſtred to the Angels*; which continued till the time of Hierom; yea, ſaith Saligniacus, [e] *The holm is yet to be ſeen, before the entrance of the Tabernacle of Abraham.* The old being dried, an other ſprung out of its root. Now this Saligniacus lived but awhile ſince. Beſides, the *Quercus Mambre, The oak of Mambre* was ſo renowned, that Adrichomius, in his map of the Tribe of Judah, hath the reſemblance, and picture of an oak there growing. And *Conſtantine appointed a fair Church to be built at the oak of Mambre*, ſaith Euſebius *in vita Conſtantini*, 3. 5. S. Hierom, *de locis Hebraicis*, thus, [f] *The oak of Abraham, called alſo the oak of Mambre, continued to the Empire of Conſtantine: and its monument is yet ſeen: And ſince we have built a Church in that place, all nations do reverence the place of the Turpentine tree, becauſe under that did Abraham entertain Angels.* The third may well be *Spelunca Adam*, the cave where Adam mourned. Fourthly, the very plot of ground, where Abel was ſlain, which is ſhewed to this day. Fifthly, the monument of Caleb. Sixthly, the field of Damaſcus, where the red earth lieth, of which they report Adam was formed; which earth is tough, and may be wrought like wax, and lieth cloſe by Hebron; all the other things alſo being in the circuit neare that place. Seventhly, the *Montana Hebron*, Joſh. 11. 21. and the *Vallis Hebron*, Geneſ. 37. 14. and the *Convallis Mambre*, as the Vulgat hath it ſignificantly, Gen. 14. 13. *Convallis Mambre, quæ eſt in Hebron, The dale of Mambre, ſurrounded with hills, which is in Hebron*, Geneſ. 13. 18. The unparallelled eminencies of which hills and dales, for profit and pleaſure, (the two main load-ſtones of the worlds deſires) you may diſcern by what Mr George Sands ſaith (if he do not poetize, or hyperbolize) in the third book of the relation of his journey, pag. 150. *We paſſed this day* (ſaith he) *through the moſt pregnant and pleaſant valley that ever eye beheld: on the right hand, a ridge of high hills, whereon ſtands Hebron, (oh how delicately ſituated!) on the left hand, the Mediterranean ſea, bordered with continuall hills, beſet with varietie of fruits: the champion between, about twentie miles over, full of flowry hills, aſcending leiſurely, and not much ſurmounting their ranker valleys: with groves of Olives, and other fruits diſperſedly adorned.* Eighthly and laſtly, there were other things of ſingular note; Abrahams Church-yard, the field of Machpela, conſecrated from heatheniſh profanation, to holier uſes; and the cave, which was the place of his ſepulchre. From ſome foure of theſe moſt reverend monuments, or the like, being but a little diſtant from Hebron, might the place be called *Kariath-arbee, Civitas quatuor rerum, The citie of foure things.*

5. Again, if that citie of Hebron were *quadrata*, as many cities then were, and now are, and with us Briſtol amongſt the

[e] *Oſtenditur adhuc hodie ilex illa, ante oſtium tabernaculi Abrahæ.*

[f] *Quercus Abrahæ, quæ & Mambre, uſq; ad Conſtantii Regis imperium monſtrabatur: & Mauſoleum ejus in præſentiarũ cernitur. Cúmq; à vobis jam ibidem Eccleſia ædificata ſit, à cunctis in circuitu gentibus, Terebinthus ſuperſtitioſè colitur*, (or as others better reade it, *Terebinthi locus colitur*) *eò quòd Abraham ſub ea Angelos hoſpitio ſuſceperit.*

the reſt (built of old by Brennus, as I have read in a manuſcript of Edward the fourth his time) and renowned Rome (as ſome ſay, varying from Livie) which was firſt founded on the foure hills, Palatine, Capitoline, Eſquiline, Aventine, (though afterward Servius Tullus enlarged it on the other three hills, Cœlian, Viminal, and Quirinal) and anſwerable to which Romulus left (as they ſay) but foure gates, *Carmentalis, Romana, Pandana, Janualis:* though afterward there were many more gates belonging to that citie. You may finde this in a map of Roſinus, *Antiq. Roman. lib. 1. cap. 13.* deſcribing the citie of Rome as it was built by Romulus; and afterwards made more great and capacious by the Kings. And Livie himſelf ſaith, That *when Romulus divided the tribes or wards of the citie into foure parts, he did it anſwerable to the quarters and hills of the citie.* It being (I ſay) probable, that the citie of Hebron was *quadrata*, it might be called Τετράπολις, and *Kiriath-arbee*, of רָבַע, RABA, *quadravit:* from whence cometh רֻבַּע, RABUA, or RABUANG, *quadratum & quadrum; cujus latera quatuor longitudine & latitudine ſunt æqualia, Whoſe foure ſides are equall in length and latitude.* As Exod. 27. 1. *Altare erit quadratum, The Altar ſhall be foure-ſquare:* from whence alſo cometh אַרְבַּע, ARBA, *quatuor.* So from the foure-ſquare building of the citie, it may be called *Kiriath-arbee*; as old Jeruſalem, *which was built foure-ſquare on the foure hills, mount Sion, mount Moria, mount Acra, and mount Bezetha,* ſaith the Tranſlatour of the travels of the holy Patriarchs. As the new Jeruſalem Τετράγωνος κεῖται, *Quadrangularis ſita eſt,* vel, *In quadro poſita eſt, Lieth foure-ſquare,* Apoc. 21. 16. So that *Kiriath-arbee, Civitas quatuor,* may be expounded, *Civitas quadrilatera, quadrimembris, quadricollis, A citie of foure ſides, foure parts, foure hills:* for even ſo Rome is called *Septicollis, The citie of ſeven hills.* And Douza of late, and ancienter Nicetas, call Conſtantinople alſo Πόλιν ἑπτάλοφον, *Urbem ſepticollem, The citie of ſeven hills.* And indeed, the ſame Tranſlatour in his *Itinerarium totius Sacræ Scripturæ, pag.* 85. thus reporteth, *Others there are that ſay, the citie Hebron, being divided into foure parts, was therefore called* Τετράπολις *for* ARBA *ſignifieth a quaternion, from the root* רָבַע, RABA, *Foure-ſquare.*

6. But grant we further, that *Kiriath-arbee* doth here ſignifie the citie of foure men: yet it followeth not, it was ſo called becauſe Adam, Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob were theſe foure men. For *Heth, the ſonne of that curſed Canaan, whoſe poſteritie (the Hittites) inhabited in it, firſt built the citie,* ſaith he *ibid.* in his *Itinerar.* and Heth might be one of theſe foure men. Secondly, it is ſaid Gen. 35. 27. *Jacob came unto Mambre, unto the citie of Arbee, which is Hebron.* Whence we may conclude, that the citie had three other names, of three other diſtinct men,

viz.

viz. of Mambre, who was Abrahams friend and confederate, Geneſ.14.13. of Arbee, a great giant (as I proved before) of Hebron, one of Calebs ſonnes ſo called, 1. Chron.2.42. But how in Jacobs time (or perhaps in Moſes time, who wrote the book of Geneſis) it might be called Hebron of Calebs unborn ſonne, is difficult to conceive, unleſſe by propheticall anticipation. Howſoever, Adrichomius ſaith word for word out of Hierom, [g] *Hebron was ſo called from one of the ſonnes of Caleb.* I ſhould rather think, Caleb himſelf, well known to Moſes, might be the fourth man, of whom the citie might be called *Civitas quatuor hominum, The citie of foure men,* if from men it had its denomination of *Kiriath-arba:* For *Joſuah gave unto Caleb, Hebron for an inheritance,* Joſh. 14. 13. and becauſe he drove thence the three famous giants, the grand-children of Arba, *the ſonnes of Anak; Sheſhai, Ahiman, and Talmi,* Joſh. 15. 14. for Conquerours left their names unto the cities which they overcame, 2. Sam. 12. 28. Neither is it unlikely, but Caleb might call his ſonne *Hebron,* after the name of the citie bequeathed him, rather then the citie, after his ſonnes name, eſpecially, ſince there is mention of a citie *Hebron* before there is any mention of a man *Hebron,* or of Caleb himſelf.

[g] *Hebron, ab uno filiorum Caleb, ſortita eſt vocabulum.*

Moreover, I reade of an other expoſition given by Solomo Trecenſis, that it might be called *Civitas quatuor virorum, The citie of foure men,* from Anak and his three monſtrous before-recited ſonnes, who dwelt there. For both cities and lands have been called after the names of giants: as Aſhtaroſh, *aliàs* Haſhtaroth, Aſeroth, and Aſtaroth-Carnaim, and Carnaim-Aſtradoth in the confines of the land of Hus was a great citie, inhabited by giants called Carnaim, or Rephaim (and *the place,* ſaith Adrichomius, *was called* TERRA GIGANTUM) whom Chedorlaomer killed when in the time of Abraham he led an armie, and fought againſt the king of Sodom, Geneſ.14.5. And *there was a valley of giants not farre from the cave of Adullam,* ſaith Vatablus on 2. Sam. 23. 13. and the Seventie reade in that place, ἐν τῇ κοιλάδι τῶν τιτάνων, *In the cave or den of giants:* and ſo both the Interlinearie and Genevans have it in the margine, which others reade *in valle Rephaim.* So much be ſaid to ſhew it might be called *Kiriath-arbee,* from other foure men, and not from the foure Patriarchs, if from foure men it had its appellation.

7. Grant we yet once again, more then we need, that it was called *Kiriath-arbee* from foure Patriarchs, yea and from the buriall of foure Patriarchs in that place (which can never be proved;) yet it is not evinced, nor will follow neceſſarily, that Adam was one of theſe foure Patriarchs there buried. S. Hierom, *in Epitaph. ſanct. Paulæ,* ſaith, Kiriath-arbee was [h] *The town of foure men,* of Abraham, Iſaac, Jacob, and the great

[h] *Oppidum quatuor virorum.*

great Adam, whom the Jews ſay to be there buried, according to the book of Joſhua; *Though* (ſaith he) [i] *moſt think Caleb was the fourth man, whoſe rib is a memoriall.* And Adrichomius himſelf makes the ſepulchre of Caleb not farre from Hebron. The opinion of Adams being there buried, is fathered on the Jews: the common Tenet was; that Caleb was the fourth man. Probabilitie alſo conſorteth therewith: for if Adam had been there buried; as Abraham could not have been ignorant thereof, ſo he would, in that regard, have the rather bought that place, and perhaps would have given intimation of it to the children of Heth. But as it ſhould ſeem, Abraham ſtood indifferent at the firſt, and ſaid onely, *Give me a poſſeſsion of a burying-place with you*, Geneſ. 23. 4. And when they offered him any of their ſepulchres, he choſe the cave of Machpelah. To conclude, the objection of Adrichomius is thus anſwered: Kiriath-Arbee may ſignifie the citie of Arbee; or the citie of foure things noted and memorable; or the citie of foure angles, ſides, or parts; the citie ſited on foure hills; and if it be to be interpreted, *Civitas quatuor hominum, A citie of foure men*, the foure men may be, Heth, Mambre, Arbe, and Caleb; or Anak and his three monſtrous ſonnes. Howſoever, the word proves not, that foure men were there buried: and if it proved ſo much, yet Adam was none of theſe foure; for Adam was not buried in Hebron, but in mount Calvarie, as I proved before to the full, and yet ſhall adde more by and by.

8. To the laſt and fourth objection of S. Hierom, being a demand, why others even theeves were there buried? I anſwer, Though Adam were there buried, yet what hindered, but it might be a fit place for malefactours to be executed, eſpecially being on high, and without the walls of the citie? and both theeves might there ſuffer as in a place appointed for ſuch uſe by the Magiſtrate; and Chriſt might there die, as appointed by the ſecret providence of God, beyond the reach of man, that the bloud of the ſecond Adam might fall on the ſepulchre of the firſt Adam, and other ſinners: to ſignifie, that the water and bloud flowing from Chriſt, did purge even the greateſt malefactours, Adam, and the notorious ſonnes of Adam. Divinely ſaith S. Auguſtine, *Serm. 72. de tempore*, [k] *Truely, brethren, with good reaſon we beleeve, that there the Phyſician was lifted up where the ſick man lay: and it was well worthy that divine mercie ſhould there ſtoop, where humane pride fell; that Chriſts precious bloud vouchſafing corporally to touch and moiſten the aſhes of old Adam, may be beleeved to redeem him.*

To conclude, either the two learned women, Paula and Euſtochium, or Hierom rather himſelf (whoſe ſtyle it ſeems to be) *in Epiſt. 17. ad Marcellam*, ſaith, [l] *In this place then Adam*

[i] *Plerique Caleb quartum putant, cujus ex latere, memoria monſtratur.*

[k] *Et verè fratres non incongruè creditur, quia ibi erectus ſit Medicus, ubi jacebat Ægrotus: & dignum erat, ubi occiderat humana ſuperbia, ibi ſe inclinaret divina Miſericordia; ut ſanguis ille pretioſus, etiam corporaliter puiverem antiqui peccatoris dum diguatur ſtillando contingere, redemiſſe credatur.*

Adam both dwelt and died: From whence that place where our Lord was crucified is called CALVARIA; *becauſe there was buried the head of the old Adam, that the bloud of the ſecond Adam, namely Chriſt, diſtilling from the croſſe, might blot out the ſinnes of the firſt-formed Adam, thereunder lying.*

9. An objection more, Franciſcus Lucas Brugenſis toucheth at, againſt this opinion: namely, that if the Jews had known that Adams ſepulchre was on that mount Calvarie, they would have had the place in farre greater eſteem; they would have deckt it with ſome ſtately monument; and never have ſuffered the malefactours inordinately there to be executed. The former part of which objection, as I do ſtrengthen by Matth.23.29. *Ye build the tombes of the Prophets, and garniſh the tombes of the righteous*, ſaith Chriſt to the Scribes and Phariſees: ſo to it I anſwer thus; That there is not the leaſt touch in Scripture, nor in any Authour, that I remember, that the Jews ever regarded or honoured Adam, or held him righteous, or gloried in him above others: nay, they thought ill of him, 2. Eſdr. 3.21. &c. and 2.Eſdr.4.30. and finde fault with him 2.Eſdr.7.48. *O thou Adam, what haſt thou done? for though it was thou that ſinned, thou art not fallen alone, but we all that come of thee.* And a little before, namely verſe 46. *This is my firſt and laſt ſaying, that it had been better not to have given the earth unto Adam; or elſe when it was given him, to have reſtrained him from ſinning.* Mark alſo the Antitheſis uſed Eccleſiaſticus 49.16. *Sem and Seth were in great honour among men; and ſo was Adam above every living thing in the creation:* where he remarkably extolleth Sem and Seth; but praiſeth Adams excellencie onely at the creation: And ſo Vatablus expounds it. Howſoever, after his fall he was not ſo highly eſteemed as others were. No more did the multitude ſhew any extraordinary eſtimate of Noah, though as Adam was the fruitfull root, the protoplaſt; ſo Noah was the reſtorer of mankinde, under God: For theſe were the founders as well of Gentiles as Jews. But Abraham, and the Patriarchs, and the Prophets ſince them, they reverenced above meaſure, for the extraordinary bleſſings vouchſafed by God unto the Jews above the Gentiles for their ſakes, and in them, and by them. Now to ſuch indeed their poſteritie builded tombes, Matth. 23.30. though their fathers had killed ſome of them.

To the ſecond part of the objection, *Why they did ſuffer malefactours to be there puniſhed*; I anſwer, that it is a doubt undecided, whether the ordinary delinquents were put to death on mount Calvarie, before the Romanes overcame the Jews. If not, then patience perforce; they could not remedie it, if the other appointed it. If ſo, yet the Jews might be ignorant of Adams ſepulchre: and how could they grace

[1] *In hoc tunc loco, & habitâſſe dicitur, & mortuus eſſe Adam: unde & locus, in quo crucifixus eſt Dominus noſter,* CALVARIA *appellatur; quòd ibi ſit antiqui hominis Calvaria condita, ut ſecundi Adam, id eſt, Chriſti ſanguis, de Cruce ſtillans, primi Adam & jacentis Protoplaſti peccata diluceret.*

and beautifie his tombe, when they knew not where he lay? Again, what if I ſay, That like as Gods eternall decree and determinate counſel being, that Chriſt ſhould die for our ſinnes, the Jews and Gentiles, Prieſts, Scribes and Phariſees, yea the devils themſelves were, for a while and a time, blinded, that they knew not, or would not know Chriſt to be the Meſſiah, though they had more evident miraculous proofs of his working, then could be of a buriall-place, ſo long fore-paſſed, as Adams was; but put him to death, Act.2.23. and chap.3.17. So Gods eternall decree, that Chriſt ſhould be crucified in the execution-place of malefactours, and in the place of Adams ſepulchre, being (perhaps) to this end, to manifeſt, that Chriſts bloud did waſh and purge ſinne originall, ſinne actuall; Adam and notorious offenders, with all and all manner of perſons; and all, and all kinde of ſinnes; the people were alſo blinded, that either they did not know, or not reſpect the place of Adams buriall; eſpecially ſince God often caſts in their teeth Adams diſobedience, and compared their ſinnes to his; *They, like Adam, have tranſgreſſed the covenant*, Hoſ. 6.7. Where Druſius preferreth this reading with us, with Hierom, with Pagnine, and with Rabbi Solomon, the ordinarie Interpreter of the Hebrews, before the reading of Junius and Tremellius, and the Genevans. And Jerem.32.19. *Gods eyes were open to all the wayes of the ſonnes of Adam.* Which is alſo confirmed, Iſa.43.27. 2.Eſdr.7.11. Thus much in love of truth, againſt all oppoſites, with Pineda, for the common opinion of the Fathers, that Adam was buried on Golgotha. I adde, that if any of the Patriarchs aroſe bodily, Adam was one. For, upon other reaſons hereafter to be ſhewen, I dare not be ſo aſſertive, as the Liturgies of divers Churches, and as divers Fathers, who are expreſſe, that Adam was raiſed from his grave. See them cited by the learned James Uſher, Biſhop of Meath, in his anſwer to a challenge made by a Jeſuit, pag.324.— which is the next point to be handled.

O Light inacceſsible, O Ancient of dayes, O Fulneſſe of knowledge, govern me walking in the paths of darknes, in things of old, in ambiguities and uncertainties of opinion, and keep me from ſingularitie of ſelf-preſuming; that I may keep the unitie of truth in the bond of peace, through him, who is both our Truth and our Peace, even Jeſus Chriſt the Righteous. Amen.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

1. Though Adam was buried on Calvarie, as Pineda ſaith, yet his proofs are weak, that Adam was raiſed with Chriſt, and went bodily into heaven with him. The cited place of Athanaſius proveth onely Adams burial there. Origen, in the place cited, is againſt Pineda. Auguſtine is palpably falſified.

2. Adams skull ſhewed lately at Jeruſalem.

3. Dionyſius Carthuſianus ſaith, Eve then aroſe. His opinion is without proof.

4. Nor Abraham then aroſe.

5. Nor Iſaac then aroſe, whatſoever Pineda affirmeth.

1. BUt the ſecond part of Pineda his opinion, on Job the 19. 25. I cannot like, though he laboureth to prove it, partly by authoritie, partly by reaſon; That thoſe many, who aroſe about the time of Chriſts Paſſion, aſcended bodily into heaven with him. As Authours, he citeth Athanaſius in his Sermon on the Paſſion and the Croſſe, Origen, &c. That Adam was buried on Golgotha, Athanaſius ſaith; but that Adam aroſe not long after Chriſts reſurrection, I cannot finde in him, or cited by any other out of him. As for Origen his ſecond Authour, in the ſame Tractate cited by Pineda, he maketh directly againſt him: for he maintaineth from Tradition, that the firſt Adam was buried where Chriſt was crucified: that as in Adam all die, ſo in Chriſt all ſhould be made alive: that in the place of a skull, the head of mankinde (namely Adam) *Reſurrectionem inveniat cum populo univerſo, ſhould partake of the generall reſurrection*, by the reſurrection of our Lord and Saviour, who there ſuffered and roſe again. But the laſt and beſt Authour, the divine S. Auguſtine, is palpably and apparently falſified: for he hath no ſuch word in the quoted place. Laſtly, the reaſon that Pineda alledgeth is ſhallow, That Adam who heard the ſentence of death, ſhould preſently be partaker of the reſurrection by him, and with him, who had ſatisfied for the ſinne. What likelihood is there of inference or coherence? I dare ſay, not one of the Fathers cited at large by Baronius, Salianus, and Maldonate, to prove that Adam was buried in Golgotha, do

give the leaſt touch at this reaſon of Pineda; but many other ends of Adams being there buried do they muſter up.

2. And the Jeſuite Pineda, either knew it not, or forgot it, or ſleeked it over, as little imagining we ſhould have notice that the cheating prieſts, who kept the ſepulchre, and the Church built over it, at Jeruſalem, did ſhew to the devout Chriſtians a skull, which they ſaid was the skull of Adam: of which, they ſaid alſo, the mountain was called *Golgotha*, as ſaith the eye and eare-witneſſe, Mr. Fines Moriſon, in his firſt part, 3. book, 2. chap. pag. 230. and pag. 233. Thus, according to them, Adam either aroſe not hitherto; or aroſe without a head, at leaſt without his skull; or with an other mans head: which three latter wayes deſtroy the truth of the reſurrection. Therefore he aroſe not at all as yet. Laſtly, ſhould we grant that Adam did bodily ariſe with Chriſt; yet hath Pineda neither Authour nor reaſon, that Adam aſcended with Chriſt into heaven (as I ſaid before) which is the main point now in queſtion. Thus much (if not too much) touching Adam.

3. Eve alſo aroſe, ſaith Dionyſius Carthuſianus on Matth. 27. but voucheth no authoritie, nor produceth any reaſon, or probabilitie: and therefore I paſſe it over the more ſlightly; adding onely this, that in the Original it is not, πᾶν ἁγίων, but πολλῶν· ſo that except ἀνθρώπων be underſtood, either no women aroſe, or more then one or two; though Pineda mentioneth not one woman; and Carthuſian, but onely and ſoly Eve. But why Eve ſhould rather ariſe, then Sarah, or the mother of Moſes, who were ſingled out for famous *Heroinæ*, Hebr. 11. or other Prophetiſſes, in the Old and New Teſtament, as old Anna, and the like, I ſee no reaſon: or that Eve in her raiſed bodie, ſhould be tranſlated into heaven, and not Adam her husband, nor Abraham, nor David, is both fooliſh and fabulous. This have I ſaid, as ſuppoſing the words to be underſtood of women alone, as indeed they are not; nor probably can they be applied to women mixt with men, ſo far as any likelihood could preſent it ſelf to the great conjecturer Pineda, who would have balked none of them.

4. Abraham aroſe, ſaith Pineda on Job 19. and annexeth this colour, becauſe *Abraham rejoyced to ſee Chriſts day, and ſaw it, and was glad*, John 8.56. I anſwer, Whatſoever is meant by theſe words of the Text, *My day:* either Chriſts Godhead; which Abraham ſaw, [a] *Becauſe he acknowledged the myſterie of the Trinitie,* ſaith S. Auguſtine: Or the day of Chriſts nativitie; which Abraham might have notice of in his life time, by ſupernaturall inſpirations; and then did remember, being dead; and deſired that day (for, ſeparated ſouls have both remembrance and appetite intellectuall, as I ſhall evidence hereafter:)

[a] *Quia myſterium Trinitatis agnovit.*

Or

Or it may be, Abraham being in bliſſe, might firſt know it, by divine illumination, ſo ſoon as the day came; and thereupon rejoyced, as the Angel did; and the heavenly hoſt, Luke 2. 13. of which hoſt, Abraham might be one: for, *even the ſouls of men are alſo called* στρατεύματα τὰ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, *Revel.* 19. 14. ſaith Gregory, Moral. 31. 12. In the foreſaid place of Luke mention is made of an Angel and the heavenly hoſt; whereas, if onely Angels were the heavenly hoſt, it might have been onely ſaid, *The Angels*: or onely, *The heavenly hoſt*: but, *The Angel* and *the heavenly hoſt* may give us cauſe to think, that there were ſome of the heavenly hoſt, which were not Angels; though Angels onely be mentioned. If ſo; humane ſouls were part of that quire: and then Abraham, in likelihood, was one of them. Now, as the chief Angel; like a chaunter, began the Evangeliſme of Chriſts birth; ſo might it be anſwered by the heavenly hoſt; *viz.* (as is probable) partly by the Angels ſinging *Glory to God in the higheſt*; partly by Abraham, and the ſouls of men, concluding the Anthem, *On earth peace, good will toward men.* I ſay, Whatſoever is meant by the words *My day*, they cannot be expounded of Chriſts reſurrection.

Some there are, who interpret *My day*, of the time of Chriſts paſſion; whom Maldonate juſtly miſliketh, *becauſe* (ſaith he) *it is added*, ABRAHAM SAW IT, AND REJOYCED: *but then, when Chriſt ſaid theſe words, Abraham could not ſee Chriſts paſsion, becauſe it was not yet come.* I may ſay the ſame or more, againſt Pineda, who will have it expounded of the day of Chriſts reſurrection: for, Chriſt ſpeaketh of the day that was paſt, he *did ſee it*, he *was glad*, and *rejoyced*: ſo that day was ended, when Chriſt ſaid this: but Chriſts reſurrection was not accompliſhed, when he uttered theſe words: therefore they cannot be underſtood of Chriſts reſurrection. And if they were ſo to be interpreted, yet it is not written, *Abraham aroſe*, or *Abraham was partaker with Chriſt*, or *Abraham aſcended bodily into heaven* (this being the iſſue, which we joyned, in this controverſie:) but, *Abraham rejoyced, he ſaw it, and was glad*: which words differ farre from Pineda his ridiculous interpretation.

5. *An other, which roſe at the ſame time, was Iſaac* (ſaith Pineda, ibid.) *for he was a parable of the reſurrection; and this was done, to recompenſe the fear* (*which poſſeſſed Iſaac*) *of being ſlain, when he repreſented Chriſt.*

To this *puncto* I anſwer; Pineda himſelf will not ſay, that every one, who was a parable, or pledge of the reſurrection, or who figured it, was raiſed; as Samſon from his ſleep, ariſing in ſtrength, and carrying away the gates of Azzah, in type of Chriſt, who brought away the gates both of death and hell: or thoſe, who were raiſed by the Prophets, or by Chriſt himſelf, or

the like; for he mentioneth none of theſe. Secondly, what proof, what conſequence, what ſhadow of truth is there, that Iſaac his fear, which was paſt (he being dead one thouſand ſeven hundred yeares before) ſhould juſt now be recompenſed, and recompenſed by being raiſed to a temporall life? which was a poore reward, if he aſcended not into heaven: which Pineda proveth not, nor can prove. Laſtly, though it be truth it ſelf, that Jacob *ſware by the fear of his father Iſaac*, Geneſ. 31. 53. yet it is not meant, as Pineda fancieth, the fear that Iſaac was in, when he was to be offered. For (I ſuppoſe) he knew by Abraham, that it was Gods eſpeciall appointment; and that he alſo willingly offered himſelf; and might think (as Abraham did) *that God was able to raiſe him up even from the dead*, Hebr. 11. 19. that in his voluntarie condeſcent, and free-will-offering, he might be a type of Chriſt, who *layed down his life*, John 10. 17. But the fear of Iſaac was either the filial fear, by which Iſaac reverenced & worſhipped God, (as Aben Ezra and Cajetan ſay) or the pious and humane fear, wherewith Jacob revered his father Iſaac: or ratheſt of all, *Fear* is here taken for the object of fear, Metonymically, for God himſelf: as it is alſo taken, Eſa. 8. 13. *Let God be your fear; let God be your dread*; as Cornelius Cornelii à lapide hath obſerved, after Auguſtine, and divers others: for, not Iſaac his fright, or Jacob his pietie, is to be ſworn by, but *God*, Deuter. 6. 13.

O God, the God of Abraham, Iſaac and Jacob, the God of the living, and not of the dead; I beſeech thee, make me to die to my ſelf, and live to thee; through him, whom the Fathers looked for, and whoſe day Abraham rejoyced to ſee, even Jeſus Chriſt, thy onely Sonne, my alone Saviour. Amen.

CHAP. VIII.

1. *Pineda his fancie, that Jacob then was raiſed.*

2. *The reaſon, why the Patriarchs deſired the Tranſlation of their bones, was not, to riſe with Chriſt, as Pineda opineth; but upon other grounds, and to other ends.*

3. *Where Joſeph was firſt buried, where ſecondly.*

4. *The great difficultie of* Act. 7. 16. *propounded. Two anſwers diſliked. The original is not corrupt.*

5. *Beza taxed for imputing corruption to the original, on* Mat. 13. 35. *and on* Luk 22. 20. *and on* Matth. 27. 9. *All theſe places*

places defended, and the ſacred Majeſtie of Scripture, vindicated from criticiſme. Many good anſwers to Matth. 27. 9. *Eraſmus faulty with Beza.*

6. *S. Auguſtine and Cyrill againſt them.*

7. *Maſius and Junius prefer the Arabick and Syriack before the Greek. Junius recanteth. A little errour may (perhaps) be aſcribed to the Tranſcribers. A generall errour in Greek and Latine may not be admitted in all copies of Scriptures.*

1. JAcob *then alſo aroſe*, ſaith Pineda in the ſame place; *ſince he had a great care of tranſlating his bones, out of Egypt, into the land of Canaan*, Geneſ. 49. 29. By the ſame reaſon, the Jeſuit might have argued, that Joſeph then alſo aroſe: for he had the like care of his bones, Geneſ. 50.25. yea a greater care: for he took a ſtrict oath (Exod. 13. 19.) of the children of Iſrael, for the performance of his deſire; whereas Jacob put Joſeph onely to the oath; and concerning the reſt of his children, it was but a fatherly command. Yet Pineda skippeth over Joſeph, who was a lively parable and figure of Chriſt in moſt things; as being the beſt beloved of his father; as being ſent to look to his brethren; as hated of them and ſold by them, and put into the pit; as thruſt into the dungeon; as being innocent, and falſly accuſed; as being taken *out of the pit*, Geneſ. 37.28. and *out of the dungeon*, Geneſ. 41. 14. as raiſed, and raiſed to be next to Pharaoh himſelf; as being worſhipped by his brethren; as having the double portion of the firſt-born; as a mediatour for his brethren, and a preſerver of them in the time of need.

2. But the truth is, neither Jacob, nor Joſeph ever deſired the removal of their bones, in that regard, which Pineda aimeth at: and never any (that I could reade) but he, and the Authour of the ſcholaſticall hiſtorie, *Quæſt.* 100 *in Geneſ.* averre ſo much: it being againſt reaſon; for then the Patriarchs would have cauſed their bones to have been tranſlated to Jeruſalem, being the right way from Hebron to Calvarie; or to mount Calvarie itſelf. But Jacob was buried by Hebron, thirtie miles, or thereabout, from Golgotha; and Joſeph was buried in the Tribe of Ephraim, and not of Judah. Now as they were to paſſe from the land of Goſhen to Sychem, they muſt paſſe not farre from Hebron; and from thence neare to Jeruſalem; and leaving Jeruſalem, and mount Calvarie but a little, the way was to Sychem, in the Tribe of Ephraim. Therefore, if they deſired to be tranſlated, in hope of ſuch a reſurrection with Chriſt, (as Pineda wildely imagineth) they would never have carried their bones cloſe by mount Calvarie, and ſo beyond it; but there would have

have depoſited them: nor would have tranſported them to Sychem, which was about as farre beyond the ſepulchre of the firſt and ſecond Adam, as Hebron, the buriall-place of Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob, was ſhort of mount Calvarie. Their aim was to be buried in the land of Canaan, as the land of promiſe, as the figure of heaven, as the ground which their Fathers bought and payd for, and were interred in. *I will lie with my Fathers, and thou ſhalt carrie me out of Egypt, and bury me in their burying-place*, ſaith Jacob, Geneſ. 47.30. and *bury me with my Fathers*, Geneſ. 49.29. ſaith the ſame Jacob. Beſides, if with reference to Chriſt his reſurrection, and in hope to be then and there raiſed by him and with him, they removed their bones into Canaan; it was to be neare to Chriſts riſing-place, and to ſave part of the long journey from Goſhen to Golgotha. But this can be no reaſon; for *Job aroſe*, ſaith Pineda: but he was buried in the land of Hus, in Arabia, not neare unto Calvarie, though not ſo farre indeed as Goſhen. And Moſes died in the wilderneſſe; and Daniel in the captivitie of Babylon; which was farther off, then the land of Goſhen, from Chriſts ſepulchre, by almoſt five hundred miles; and yet *Daniel and Moſes aroſe alſo*, ſaith Pineda. And Noah died hard by mount Ararat in Armenia, 600 miles North-ward from Jeruſalem, or thereabout: yet *Noah alſo aroſe*, ſaith Pineda. Now, why could not Jacob and Joſeph be raiſed, and come a ſhorter way, from Goſhen to Jeruſalem, then Daniel or Noah could a longer way? And to beat Pineda with his own words, [a] *Were they terrified or wearied with the tediouſneſſe of the way, who enjoyed an immortall life; that they could not come fitly from ſo remote a region?* Or, *can they be truelier ſaid to come into a place, into the holy citie, that come from neare, then they that come from farre?* This Pineda alledgeth, to prove that the graves of Saints opened afarre off, as well as at Jeruſalem: Therefore ſay I, What need they care to have their bones brought neare to Golgotha, to that end and purpoſe?

3 Concerning Joſeph, *he was firſt buried on an high ground, upon a little branch of Nilus, in a citie now called* El-fium (ſaith John Leo, upon report, in his eighth book of the hiſtorie of Africa) *and Moſes digged up his bones.* Secondly, it is ſaid expreſly, Joſh. 24. 32. *the children of Iſrael buried his bones in Sychem, in a parcel of ground which Jacob bought of the ſonnes of Hemor, the father of Sychem, for an hundred pieces of ſilver; and it became the inheritance of the children of Joſeph.* On which place, Maſius inquiring, *why holy men ſhould ſo earneſtly contend to be buried in Canaan*, anſwereth himſelf, [b] *To confirm their countrie-mens mindes by the promiſes of God, with ſuch a faith, as death ſhould not take away.* Whereunto I adde the place of the Apoſtle, Heb. 11. 22. *By faith Joſeph, when he died, made mention of the departing of the children of Iſrael; and gave commandment concerning his bones;*

[a] *Nunquid laſſitudine viæ deterrerentur & fatigarentur, qui immortali vitâ potiebantur; ut venire ex regione longinqua opportunè non poſſent?*

[b] *Ut apud ſuorum popularium animos, fidem promiſſis Dei firmarent, qualem nè mors quidem eripere potuiſſet.*

bones; making the removing of his bones, and the memoriall thereof, a divine prognoſtick, that they ſhould come forth of the Egyptian captivitie or ſlaverie, and enjoy the land, promiſed to Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob; of which their bones, and their wives bones, before-hand did, and Joſeph his bones ſhould take ſeizen and poſſeſſion. Kimki ſaith (and Maſius likes it) that Jacob gave to Joſeph that place of buriall, becauſe he being, as it were, the Parent, Monitour, and Guide of his brethren, ſhould be wholly alienated from Egyptian affairs, to think of the land of promiſe. And ſince Maſius taxeth the Jews for thinking, that they who were buried in Canaan ſhould firſt ariſe; he would have laughed at Pineda, if he had read in him, that a Patriarch cauſed his bones to be tranſlated, in hope to be raiſed within a while of Chriſts reſurrection. [c] *Each of thoſe Fathers were ſolemnly brought into their own poſſeſsion* (ſaith the ſame Maſius:) which is thus confirmed, becauſe *Abraham did bury Sara in his own poſſeſsion*, Geneſ. 23. 19, 20. *Iſaac and Iſhmael buried Abraham in the field which Abraham purchaſed of the ſonnes of Heth*, Geneſ. 25. 9, 10. And to ſumme up the reſt, *In the cave that is in the field of Machpelah, (the purchaſed cave and field) which is before Mambre, was buried Abraham and Sara, Iſaac and Rebeka, Jacob and Lea*, Geneſ. 49. 30, 31. The diſtance of which cave or field from Calvarie, I gathered before, from Adrichomius, to be 250 *Stadia*; which, upon allowance of eight *Stadia* to one Mile, amounteth to one and thirty miles, and a quarter: from which account S. Auguſtine differeth but little, conſidering the various reckoning of miles, with the diverſe meaſurings of beginnings and endings: for, Auguſtine, *Quæſt. ſup. Geneſ. lib. 1. quæſt. 161.* thus reporteth, [d] *From the place called Abrahemium, or Abrahams church-yard, where are theſe bodies*, (namely of Abraham and Sara, Iſaac and Rebeka, Jacob and Leah) *to the place where our Lord was crucified, there is almoſt thirty miles diſtance.* Now, as the ſepulchre of the three Patriarchs was thus farre from Jeruſalem, South-weſt-ward; ſo Sychem, where Joſeph his bones were buried, was farther from Jeruſalem, toward the North.

[c] *Solenne autem fuit priſcis illis Patribus, ut quiſque in ſuam inferretur poſſeſſionem.*

[d] *Dicunt, ab eo loco, quod* ABRAHEMIUM *vocatur, ubi ſunt iſta corpora, abeſſe locum, ubi crucifixus eſt Dominus, ferè triginta milliaribus.*

4 One difficultie more there is, and a great one: I may not paſſe it; for the length will be recompenſed by the ſweetneſſe. Acts 7. 15, 16. *Jacob, and our fathers died, and were carried over unto Sychem, and laid in the ſepulchre that Abraham bought for a ſumme of money of the ſonnes of Emor the father of Sychem.* Which paſſage ſeemeth to contradict what out of other parts of Scripture I proved concerning the Patriarchs ſepulchre.

That this is a knot hard to be untied, all confeſſe: *S. Hierom promiſed in his* 101 *Epiſt. to clear it*, ſaith Lorinus: And *in his Queſtions on Geneſ.* ſaith Beza: but *he hath not performed his promiſe*, ſay both of them, on Acts 7. *Nodum nectit Hieronimus,*

mus, nec eum diſſolvit, ſaith Eraſmus: And *I onely propound it*, ſaith he, *that the ſtudious reader may be ſtirred up to diſcuſſe it.* But this is a ſhallow ſlurre, unfit for ſo great a Critick; for many had done ſo much before, and more then ſo. I come to the point.

That there are invented many wayes, and means of anſwering, cannot be denied: but ſome are vaſt and improbable; ſome more fair and expedite. The abſurd anſwers are two. The firſt, That the Originall is there corrupt; and that, for Abraham, Jacob is to be written and read; I ſay, not meant, expounded, or interpreted, but exchanged, and intruded into the Text; and that, τῷ Συχέμ, ſhould be expunged, as needleſſe; *it being with equall ignorance and boldneſſe, added by one or other*, ſaith Andrew Maſius on Joſh. 24. 32. With Maſius agreeth Beza in this, that the name of *Abraham* is crept into the Text; adding, that *the erring, in notes of number, or proper names, muſt not be aſcribed to the Authours; but to the ignorant tranſcribers.* But I ſay, that the erring in a proper name, or notes of number, may breed as great and unſufferable confuſion, unlikelihood, inconvenience, yea untruth, as the errour in any other common word. And why the errours in proper names ſhould be aſcribed to ignorant tranſcribers, rather then errours in other words; or that the holy Spirit doth priviledge other words, and not proper names, or numbers, from being miſtaken, miſplaced, miſadded, or ſuperadded in the Text, I ſee not.

Aretius bluntly blundereth it out, that you muſt underſtand *Jacob* for *Abraham:* yet by what example, or for what reaſon, he mentioneth not: but ſtumbleth on a truth; of which hereafter.

Druſius, *Præterit. lib.* 5, on the words *Quod emit Abraham*, hath yet ſome ſhew of reaſon. *It ſeemeth* (ſaith he) *it was ſometimes written,* EMIT IPSE, *that is* JACOB, *into whoſe place the name of* ABRAHAM *is crept.*

5. Beza defends it by two parallels: the firſt out of Hierom, who in his book *de optimo genere interpretandi, ad Pammachium*, noteth, that the name of *Iſaiah* was crept into many copies, on Matth. 13. 35. that afterward, the name of *Aſaph* was ſubſtituted for *Iſaiah*; and now neither of them is there read.

I anſwer to the miſapplied inſtances of Beza, that I cannot abide to hunt after errours in the Scripture, and to caſt aſperſions on it. To queſtion the corruption of the Canon, to paſſe our judgements, whether the ſquare or rule be right or crooked, to put into the Text, or to take from it, as ſome Philologizing Neotericks endeavour in their ſuper-nice criticiſme, is to tear up the very foundation of religion. Whileſt other anſwers may be found, though but probable, I ſhould not have ſuch a thought, as Beza had, on Luk. 24. 13. where he acknowledgeth, both the Syriack, and all our Copies have it Ἑξήκοντα, *Sexaginta,*

Three-

Threescore; and the exact truth is accordant to that reading: for Emaus is seven miles from Jerusalem, as Mr Sands (who rode from Jerusalem to Emaus) witnesseth, pag. 174. and threescore *Stadia* (allowing eight *Stadia* to a mile) make seven miles and an half; which halfe-mile, upon diversitie of measures, or the beginning of measuring, or ends thereof, maketh small difference. Yet Beza saith, *Aut hîc peccatum est in numero, aut apud Josephum, de Bello Judaico 7.27. non rectè scribuntur stadia triginta.* The more favourable phrase should have been by Beza ascribed rather to the Scripture, then to Josephus. Or can we think, that all Copies do erre? He maketh us fight upon the ice, and to have no firm footing. Why should he use the first part of the disjunction, when he might better distinguish, and so reconcile all? Likewise Beza, on Luke 22.20. confessing the uniformitie of reading, both in the Syriack, and all the Greek Copies which he had seen; yet addeth boldly, *Aut manifestum est solœcophanes,--- aut potiùs, cùm hæc essent ad marginem annotata ex Matthæo, & Marco, postea in Contextum irrepserunt.* Now, though he would sleek it over afterwards, saying, *Potest excusari solœcismus, &c.* yet the wound, which he gave to the Word of Truth is too deep, to be so healed; and the very plaister is offensive: for he committed a solœcisme, who looking on the *earth*, cried out, *O Cœlum!* and casting his eyes up to *heaven*, cried, *O Terra!* Had the Reverend Beza no handsomer word for his plaister? might he not have defended it, by the Hebrew Idiotisme, without calling it a Solœcisme? *Solœcophanes* might have well been spared: but *Solœcismus* is not to be endured.

Much more might be said: but I dwell unwillingly on this point; and return to the first place of Matth. 13. 35. and say, Who ever denyed, but that some Copies have been corrupted? and in some of them, some words foisted in? but all Greek, all Latine Copies, with the Arabick and Syriack translations, reade *Abraham*, and not *Jacob*: Whereas some Copies were alwayes perfect, in that place of Matthew. Now, if you grant corruption in any point, or title, in all the Greek, and all the Latine Copies; how will you prove any part or word of the New Testament to be uncorrupt? Which razeth up the very Corner-stone of our Faith.

Mr Beza again objecteth, that the name of *Jeremie* is written for *Zacharie*, Matth.27.9. I answer, that the Authour of the book of Maccabees, giveth us to understand, that Jeremie wrote other things, which now we have not, 2. Maccab. 2. 1. and so did divers of the Prophets: and why may not this be then taken from some of those works, which are perished? Secondly, S. Hierome saith, a Jew brought him an Apocryphall book of Jeremie, in which he found this testimonie,

word for word; and *this book was called* APOCRYPHA, or OCCULTA JEREMIÆ, *The Apocryphals or hid writings of Jeremie*, ſaith Eraſmus on Matth. 27. As what S. Paul ſaith of Jannes and Jambres, 2. Tim. 3. 8. and what S. Jude ſaith of Michael the Archangel, ſtriving with the Devil, is thought to be taken out of the books Apocryphall: ſo might this teſtimonie be cited alſo out of Jeremies Apocryphals. Thirdly, Eraſmus ſuppoſeth, that Zacharie had two names, and was called both Zacharie and Jeremie; and ſo no inconvenience followeth. Fourthly, not onely the Syriack leaves out the name of Jeremie, but even in Auguſtines time, the name of Jeremie was not in many Latine Copies, as Auguſtine himſelf teſtifieth, *de Conſenſu Evangeliſtarum lib. 3. cap. 7.* The ordinarie gloſſe alſo ſaith, that in ſome editions, it is onely thus, *By the Prophet*, and the name of Jeremie is left unmentioned. Fifthly, Auguſtine in the laſt recited place of his, reſolveth, that the Divine providence purpoſely ſet down *Jeremie* for *Zacharie*; and what the holy Spirit did dictate, S. Matthew did truely write. And *one reaſon why the Spirit of God confounded the names of Jeremie and Zacharie, was this*, ſaith Auguſtine; *To inſinuate, that all the Prophets wrote by one Spirit, and wonderfully conſented in one; and therefore we muſt beleeve that* [c] *What the holy Ghoſt ſpake by them is not to be appropriated unto any one, but to all and every of them.* What was ſaid by Jeremie, was as well Zacharies, as Jeremies; and what was ſaid by Zacharie, was as well Jeremies as Zacharies. God ſpake, not *by the* MOUTHS; but, *by the* MOUTH *of all his holy Prophets, ſince the world began*, Act. 3. 21. and they had but one Spirit to guide them into all truth. The Propheſie of Amos, is called *The book of the Prophets*, Acts 7. 42. and the Word of God, which in divers places is called, in the plurall number, *Scriptures*, (as John 5. 39. Ἐρευνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς, *Search the Scriptures*) is alſo oftentimes called, in the ſingular number, *The Scripture*: as John 2. 22. *they beleeved the Scripture, and the word which Jeſus had ſaid.* Beleef was to reſt, as well on his Word onely, without Scripture, as on Scripture, though he had ſaid nothing: and the word *Scripture* is not to be reſtrained onely to that place of Scripture before pointed at; but to the whole Word of God written, which they beleeved. *The Scripture hath concluded all under ſinne*, Gal. 3. 22. where not one ſingle place onely, but either common places of that point, or the whole bodie of the Scripture is to be underſtood. A few words of a Pſalme of David, is called by Chriſt himſelf, *The law of the Jews*; *It is written in their law, They hated me without a cauſe*, John 15. 25. which is onely ſo written, Pſal. 35. 19. Again, he ſaith to the Jews, John 10. 34. *Is it not written in your Law, I have ſaid, ye are Gods?* but it is written ſo onely, Pſal. 83. 6. Yea, though one and the ſame thing in effect be written,

[c] *Quæcunque per eos Spiritus Sanctus dixit, & ſingula eſſe omnium, & omnia ſingulorum.*

written, both Isa. 28. 16. and Psal. 118. 22. as also Matth 21. 42. and Acts 4. 12. yet S. Peter reckoneth all, but as one; All, but one Scripture, though severally written by these foure: *It is contained in the Scripture,* (saith he) 1. Pet. 2. 6. in the singular number; he mentioneth Scripture, as if what one wrote the rest wrote. S. Peter saith not, It is contained in the Word, with reference to one Spirit inditing or inspiring, (though that might have also been truely spoken) but contained in the Scripture, with relation to the unity and consent of the Pen-men. Lastly, the words of the Evangelist are these, Matth. 27. 9. *Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by the Prophet Jeremie, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver*; τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἱερεμίου, λέγοντος, *effatum Jeremiæ, dicentis, That which was spoken by Jeremie, saying, &c.* Now Jeremie might say it, speak it, dictate it, which is most true, and is all that S. Matthew saith; who by the Spirit might also know, that Jeremie did teach, preach, prophesie, and utter these words: and yet for all this, and after all this, Zacharie by the same Spirit might write, transcribe, and insert those words of Jeremie into his own Prophesie (which S. Matthew denieth not) as Baruch wrote divers things which he had heard from Jeremie; as Agur collected some Proverbs of Solomon. Again, there was no necessitie that all things whatsoever Jeremie, as a Prophet, did speak, [g] he himself or Baruch should write, much lesse presently: since there were many yeares between Jeremie his speaking and his writing; for Enoch prophesied, as it is in the 14. verse of the Epist. of S. Jude; but he prophesied, *Saying, &c.* as it is there written: for writing was none, till God set the Copie unto Moses, by writing the Law in the Tables on the mount.

g Jerem. 36. 2.

Again, S. Paul (Act. 24. 35.) remembreth the words of our Lord Jesus, how he said, *It is more blessed to give, then to receive:* yet none of the Evangelists record such words: but this might the Apostles relate unto S. Paul; or by divine inspiration he might know that Christ spake them; or they might be part of the words which Christ himself spake unto S. Paul: for there is no certaintie, that they were written. S. John the Evangelist was commanded to conceal, and not to write, the words of the seven thunders, Revel. 10. 4. If he had wholly concealed such a thing, we could not know it: he spake it, but wrote it not. Jeremie might speak this, and not write it; or write it, and not speak it. Any of these answers is better, then to incline to Beza, that the Text is erroneous, or patched up with a false addition; or to Erasmus, on Matth. 27. intimating, there was *lapsus memoriæ in Evangelistis:* howsoever he qualifieth it; That, if there were *memoriæ lapsus, in Nomine duntaxat,* he did think no man should be so morose, nosy, and stern, as thence to question the authoritie of the whole Scriptures.

word for word; and *this book was called* APOCRYPHA, or OCCULTA JEREMIÆ, *The Apocryphals or hid writings of Jeremie*, ſaith Eraſmus on Matth. 27. As what S. Paul ſaith of Jannes and Jambres, 2. Tim. 3. 8. and what S. Jude ſaith of Michael the Archangel, ſtriving with the Devil, is thought to be taken out of the books Apocryphall: ſo might this teſtimonie be cited alſo out of Jeremies Apocryphals. Thirdly, Eraſmus ſuppoſeth, that Zacharie had two names, and was called both Zacharie and Jeremie; and ſo no inconvenience followeth. Fourthly, not onely the Syriack leaves out the name of Jeremie, but even in Auguſtines time, the name of Jeremie was not in many Latine Copies, as Auguſtine himſelf teſtifieth, *de Conſenſu Evangeliſtarum lib. 3. cap. 7.* The ordinarie gloſſe alſo ſaith, that in ſome editions, it is onely thus, *By the Prophet*, and the name of Jeremie is left unmentioned. Fifthly, Auguſtine in the laſt recited place of his, reſolveth, that the Divine providence purpoſely ſet down *Jeremie* for *Zacharie*; and what the holy Spirit did dictate, S. Matthew did truely write. And *one reaſon why the Spirit of God confounded the names of Jeremie and Zacharie, was this*, ſaith Auguſtine; *To inſinuate, that all the Prophets wrote by one Spirit, and wonderfully conſented in one; and therefore we muſt beleeve that* [e] *What the holy Ghoſt ſpake by them is not to be appropriated unto any one, but to all and every of them.* What was ſaid by Jeremie, was as well Zacharies, as Jeremies; and what was ſaid by Zacharie, was as well Jeremies as Zacharies. God ſpake, not *by the* MOUTHS; but, *by the* MOUTH *of all his holy Prophets, ſince the world began*, Act. 3. 21. and they had but one Spirit to guide them into all truth. The Propheſie of Amos, is called *The book of the Prophets*, Acts 7. 42. and the Word of God, which in divers places is called, in the plurall number, *Scriptures*, (as John 5. 39. Ἐραυνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς, *Search the Scriptures*) is alſo oftentimes called, in the ſingular number, *The Scripture*: as John 2. 22. *they beleeved the Scripture, and the word which Jeſus had ſaid.* Beleef was to reſt, as well on his Word onely, without Scripture, as on Scripture, though he had ſaid nothing: and the word *Scripture* is not to be reſtrained onely to that place of Scripture before pointed at; but to the whole Word of God written, which they beleeved. *The Scripture hath concluded all under ſinne*, Gal. 3. 22. where not one ſingle place onely, but either common places of that point, or the whole bodie of the Scripture is to be underſtood. A few words of a Pſalme of David, is called by Chriſt himſelf, *The law of the Jews*; *It is written in their law*, *They hated me without a cauſe*, John 15. 25. which is onely ſo written, Pſal. 35. 19. Again, he ſaith to the Jews, John 10. 34. *Is it not written in your Law*, *I have ſaid, ye are Gods?* but it is written ſo onely, Pſal. 83. 6. Yea, though one and the ſame thing in effect be written,

[e] *Quæcunque per eos Spiritus Sanctus dixit, & ſingula eſſe omnium, & omnia ſingulorum.*

written, both Isa. 28. 16. and Psal. 118. 22. as also Matth 21. 42. and Acts 4. 12. yet S. Peter reckoneth all, but as one; All, but one Scripture, though severally written by these foure: *It is contained in the Scripture,* (saith he) 1. Pet. 2. 6. in the singular number; he mentioneth Scripture, as if what one wrote the rest wrote. S. Peter saith not, It is contained in the Word, with reference to one Spirit inditing or inspiring, (though that might have also been truely spoken) but contained in the Scripture, with relation to the unity and consent of the Pen-men. Lastly, the words of the Evangelist are these, Matth. 27. 9. *Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by the Prophet Jeremie, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver;* τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἱερεμίου, λέγοντος, *effatum Jeremiæ, dicentis, That which was spoken by Jeremie, saying, &c.* Now Jeremie might say it, speak it, dictate it, which is most true, and is all that S. Matthew saith; who by the Spirit might also know, that Jeremie did teach, preach, prophesie, and utter these words: and yet for all this, and after all this, Zacharie by the same Spirit might write, transcribe, and insert those words of Jeremie into his own Prophesie (which S. Matthew denieth not) as Baruch wrote divers things which he had heard from Jeremie; as Agur collected some Proverbs of Solomon. Again, there was no necessitie that all things whatsoever Jeremie, as a Prophet, did speak, g he himself or Baruch should write, much lesse presently: since there were many yeares between Jeremie his speaking and his writing; for Enoch prophesied, as it is in the 14. verse of the Epist. of S. Jude; but he prophesied, *Saying, &c.* as it is there written: for writing was none, till God set the Copie unto Moses, by writing the Law in the Tables on the mount.

g Jerem. 36. 2.

Again, S. Paul (Act. 24. 35.) remembreth the words of our Lord Jesus, how he said, *It is more blessed to give, then to receive:* yet none of the Evangelists record such words: but this might the Apostles relate unto S. Paul; or by divine inspiration he might know that Christ spake them; or they might be part of the words which Christ himself spake unto S. Paul: for there is no certaintie, that they were written. S. John the Evangelist was commanded to conceal, and not to write, the words of the seven thunders, Revel. 10. 4. If he had wholly concealed such a thing, we could not know it: he spake it, but wrote it not. Jeremie might speak this, and not write it; or write it, and not speak it. Any of these answers is better, then to incline to Beza, that the Text is erroneous, or patched up with a false addition; or to Erasmus, on Matth. 27. intimating, there was *lapsus memoriæ in Evangelistis:* howsoever he qualifieth it; That, if there were *memoriæ lapsus, in Nomine duntaxat,* he did think no man should be so morose, nosy, and stern, as thence to question the authoritie of the whole Scriptures.

But his opinion is juſtly exploded as hypercritically nice, and Julius Scaligers whip here fetcheth bloud of Eraſmus, *Maximus eſſe potuiſſet, ſi minor eſſe voluiſſet:* He diminiſheth himſelf, by taking upon him to be a *cenſor* of the Scripture. *Nihil parturiens, continuò parit omnia,* ſaith a Papiſt of Eraſmus.

6. Wiſer S. Auguſtine, in Epiſt. 19. ad Hieronymum, thus; [h] *I have learned to give that reverence and honour onely to thoſe books of Scripture which are called Canonicall, that I moſt fully beleeve, no writer thereof erred any Iota.* But if there were *a fail of their memory*, they did *ſomewhat erre*, whatſoever Eraſmus ſhould ſeem to ſuggeſt; who would have taken it in fume, if the Friers his oppoſites had ſaid, there had been in his books *lapſus memoriæ, A fail of memorie.* S. Auguſtine is conſtant to himſelf, and to the truth: for again he ſaith, concerning the Evangeliſts, [i] *The Evangeliſts muſt be ſo farre from lying, that they muſt not fall into an untruth of forgetfulneſſe.* S. Cyril. *lib. 6. in Levitic.* toward the end of his book, aſcending from one particular, ſaith of the whole Scripture, divinely inſpired, [k] *What ſhall we ſay? ſhall we grant forgetfulneſſe in the words of the holy Ghoſt?* And he anſwereth his own queſtion, in generall, [l] *I dare not think ſo of the ſacred Text.*

7. Yea, but ſaith Maſius, *The Syriack tranſlation proves, that this place is faulty: for the Syriack Copies have it thus, Jacob was tranſlated into Sychem, and laid in the grave that Abraham bought for money of the ſonnes of Hemor.* Junius his Syriack accordeth with Maſius; and on that place Junius thus, *The Syriack Interpreter either uſed a diverſe Copie, or his own judgement and authoritie.* Laſtly, the Arabick tranſlation, as it is ſet out by Junius, readeth it correſpondently to the Syriack: and Junius on the Text, in the Arabick tranſlation, preferreth the Arabick and Syriack reading before the Greek; and the meaning of the Arabick and Syriack is this, That Jacob being dead, was carried into the field of the Sychemites; the Egyptians accompanying Joſeph, and the Iſraelites; where *ſeptemdialis luctus, Seven dayes mourning* was made; and after the mourning he was carried again from Sychem to Hebron, to be buried with Abraham. *This is wittily invented, (* ſaith Beza *) yet not to be admitted.* And indeed, Junius himſelf in his Parallels retracts it: and Chorographie ſheweth, it is no wittie invention. For Hebron lieth between Goſhen and Sychem: now that they ſhould carry him from Goſhen, even almoſt through Hebron, it is not likely. Wherefore, to conclude, neither be the Arabick or Syriack Copies of authoritie enough to confront the Greek (for the Greek was not tranſlated out of them, but they out of the Greek) neither may we yeeld, that either the Evangeliſts did *labi memoriâ, fail in their memories*; or that generally, in any place, all the Greek and Latine Copies are corrupted. If it had been a literall

[h] *Ego ſolis eis Scripturarum libris, qui jam Canonici appellantur, timorem hunc, & honorē didici deferre, ut nullum eorum autorem ſcribendo aliquid errâſſe firmiſſimè credam.*

[i] *Omnem falſitatem abeſſe ab iis decet, non ſolum eam quæ mentiendo promitur, ſed eam etiam quæ obliviſcendo.*
[k] *Quid dicemus? Oblivionem dabimus in verbis Spiritus Sancti?*
[l] *Non audeo hoc de ſacris ſentire ſermonibus.*

literall errour (as Geneſ. 3.15. the Vulgat readeth *ipſa*, for *ipſe* or *ipſum*; or *Dei*, for *diëi*, in Epiſt. Jude, verſ. 6. or *lapides ſeculi*, for *lapides ſacculi*, Proverb. 16.11. or *viduam ejus*, for *victum ejus*, Pſal. 132.15. or *fontem*, for *fortem*, Pſal. 42.2.) we would yeeld it was the fault of the tranſcriber: but to admit ſuch a corruption, wherein is no ſimilitude of letters, and in all Copies, both Greek and Latine, I cannot like, though more Authours, then Maſius, Beza, Druſius, or Eraſmus, did joyn hand in hand to juſtifie it.

O Infinite Spirit, unſearchable, yet ſearching all things; Omnipotent, yet unable to lie or be untrue; who never didſt lead into errour thy holy Inſtruments, nor ſufferedſt the Pen-men of thy ſacred Scripture to take thy Dictates amiſſe; I humbly beſeech thee to inſpire me with knowledge and zeal, to vindicate thy heavenly Word, and the moſt bleſſed Writers thereof, from imputed corruption, miſtaking, or oblivioufneſſe. Grant this, at the Mediation of my onely Lord and Redeemer, Jeſus Chriſt. Amen.

CHAP. IX.

1. *The ſecond anſwer diſliked. Melchior Canus cenſured for ſaying, S. Steven his memorie failed him. His like proof from Jephthah his miſtaking, anſwered.*

2. *An other argument of his, from* Matth. 2.6. *anſwered.*

3. *Heinſius touched at, Cuſanus rejected, for holding that Adam could have underſtood all languages now in uſe. The manner of the confuſion of tongues at Babel.*

4. *The Oriental languages, a goodly ornament, and neceſſary in ſome places. The Syriack enlightening the Greek.*

5. *The Jewiſh excommunications. Donations to Religious houſes ſealed up with curſes to the infringers. Mr. Selden in part defended, though his Hiſtorie of Tithes hath done hurt. Maran-atha. The Amphibologie of* Act. 3.21. *cleared by the Syriack. Ubiquitaries with Illyricus taxed. Heavens, and Heaven, taken for God.*

6. *Heinſius ſtrictly examined, and rejected.*

7. *Things granted:* viz. *The inſpirations and conceptions of*

holy Pen-men were under one or other language: in which conceptions they could not erre; nor could they erre in writing.

8. *Queſtions handled at large: Whether it were neceſſary that the Scripture ſhould be written: Whether the ſacred writers wrote caſually: Whether they were commanded to write: Whether they were compelled to write: Whether they underſtood all that they wrote: Whether they did reade profane Authours: Whether they ſtudied the things beforehand.*

9. *Concluſions againſt Heinſius. There was no difference between the Pen-men of the Divine writ of the Old and New Teſtament, in the point of conceiving and writing in different languages. We are not to have recourſe to the thoughts of S. John, rather then his words. They had no libertie left them, to put in their own conceits, or in writing to adde or blot out what they had done. They had no libertie to cloath their inward apprehenſions with words of their own. They did not conceive in one language, and write in another.*

1 THus then, the conſtant and uniform accordance of the Greek and Latine Copies being held for Authenticall and Canonicall, and all manner of corruption and generall aberration in any one letter being wholly removed; there is invented a ſecond way of anſwer, groſſe and abſurd; which I diſlike as ill, if not worſe then the former. A defender of it is Melchior Canus, *de Locis Theologicis, lib. 2. cap. 18.* toward the end of that book and chapter. For he would ſeem to gather from Beda and Rabanus, *That it happened to Steven, as to other common people; namely, that in a long narration, eſpecially if it be ſudden, he hath mingled and confounded ſome things, [a] And forgot himſelf in ſome things, to wit, in ſuch things as belonged little or nothing to the purpoſe: for he was buſily muſing, and intent upon the main matter.* But (ſaith he) *S. Luke writing the hiſtorie, changed not one jot, but writ as Steven ſpoke. Now we need not defend Steven from all errour and fault* (ſaith he) *but we muſt quit the Evangeliſt. For onely the Prophets, Apoſtles, and Evangeliſts, did never labi memoriâ, or erre in any matter, great or ſmall; other men did.* His proofs are theſe.

[a] *In quibuſdam etiam memoriâ lapſus fuerit.*

Jephthah in Judges 11.26. pretendeth 300 yeares poſſeſſion, when they were not ſo many: and the divine Pen-man or Hiſtoriographer, writeth as Jephthah pretended; and eſtabliſhed not the truth of the thing it ſelf.

I anſwer, that Salianus, in his *Annales, Anno Mundi* 2849, maketh

keth one account, wherein the time of the Iſraelites coming out of Egypt, to the inſtant of Jephthahs arguing, is 377 yeares: and from the death of Sihon king of the Amorites, 337 yeares. But the truth is, (if we will hit the exact number) both Salianus and Tremellius, and many others ſay, That from the coming out of Egypt, and from the giving of the Law, unto this preſent controverſie of Jephthah with the King of the Amorites, there were 305, or 306 yeares expired. And Tremellius well obſerveth, that Jephthah began his narration from their coming forth of Egypt, verſ. 16. Therefore thence beginneth the number, and the reckoning. Now the ſhortning of an account, is an uſuall Ellipſis, both in Scripture, and in other Authours. The 70 Interpreters are cited for 72. Among the Romanes, the *Centum-viri* conſiſted of one hundred and five men. Judges 20. 46. *all which fell of Benjamin that day, were* 25000. yet there fell that day 100 more, verſ. 35. So 2. Sam. 5. 5. the account is ſhortened by ſix moneths leſſe then was ſet down in the precedent verſe; it being [b] *A frequent Synecdoche, to make a round and ſmooth reckoning*, ſaith Tremellius. If any ſhall yet contend, that Jephthah ſaith expreſly, v. 26. *Iſrael dwelt in Heſhbon and her towns; and in Aroer and her towns; and in all the cities that be along by the coaſts of Arnon*, 300 *yeares*; Peter Martyr on the place anſwereth, That the Scripture-account often followeth the greater number. Now becauſe the yeares from Sihons death, were nearer 300. then 200. Jephthah reckoneth not the refract, but the whole number; and accounteth them 300 yeares, as inclining to the greater number. For Sihon was overcome, and ſlain the laſt yeare of Moſes his life; *being to the preſent debate*, 266 *yeares*, ſaith Abulenſis; 267, ſaith Lyranus; 270 *yeares*, ſaith Peter Martyr. If Peter Martyrs anſwer be ſleighted, I adde, that the perfection of Scriptures ſtands not ſo ſtrictly on exactneſſe of number, but that it puts a certain number for an uncertain. Inſtances are obvious. So, *while we plead too much for number, we ſhall*, as S. Auguſtine ſaith, *forget, or neglect, both weight and meaſure*. Laſtly, grant that Jephthah either miſtook, or miſpleaded the yeares, in a braving faſhion; and ſay, that the holy Ghoſt hath penned, not what was truth in it ſelf, but what Jephthah alledged erroneouſly, or covetouſly, for his preſcription (for Jephthah had more then one errour:) yet, it followeth not, that S. Steven was deceived; for he was *full of the holy Ghoſt*, when he ſpake this, Act. 7. 55. and before he ſpake this, he was *full of faith, and of the holy Ghoſt*, Act. 6. 5. *Full of faith and power*, verſ. 8. and they that diſputed with Steven, *were not able to reſiſt the wiſdome and the Spirit, by which he ſpake*, v. 10. Therefore he ſpake wiſely, truely, and by the Spirit, as well as S. Luke wrote by the Spirit; and neither of them could in this

[b] *Synecdoche frequens, ad rotunditatem numeri.*

paſſage erre, though Jephthah be held a man of imperfections.

2. *Secondly*, ſaith Canus, *the Evangeliſt hath it, Matth.* 2. 6. *That* IT IS WRITTEN BY THE PROPHET, AND THOU BETHLEHEM, IN THE LAND OF JUDAH, ART NOT THE LEAST AMONG THE PRINCES OF JUDAH, *when it is not ſo written by the prophet; who ſaith, Micah* 5. 2. BUT THOU BETHLEHEM EUPHRATA, THOUGH THOU BE LITTLE AMONG THE THOUSANDS OF JUDAH; *the ſenſe being very different, almoſt contrary.* In which place S. Matthew reports the words, not as they are in Micah; but as the chief Prieſts and Scribes recited them to Herod. [c] *Which teſtimonie* (ſaith Hierome on Micah 5. 2.) *agreeth neither with the Hebrew, nor the Seventie; as is plain, though I ſay nothing.* Then followeth his opinion, [d] *I think that S. Matthew being willing to reprove the negligence of the Scribes and Prieſts, toward the reading of holy Scriptures, related the words, as they were cited by them.* So that though the Scribes and Phariſees were blinde, and, ſeeing the Prophet through a vail, took one thing for an other; and though the Evangeliſt purpoſely reciteth their miſtaking, that we might diſcern the fault of theſe ill guides, and ignorant teachers, yet it no way followeth, that S. Steven did erre, or was miſtaken, or that S. Luke miſreported the words of S. Steven. But enough of this, to teſtifie my diſlike of the ſecond opinion, and of ſuch, who excuſing the Greek Text from corruption, (wherein I wonderfully applaud them) do impute an errour and ſlip unto the holy, powerfull, gracefull, truth-ſpeaking, and dying Protomartyr, S. Steven (which I cannot endure in them.) And certes, both theſe former rejected opinions are built on a falſe ground, and idlely do preſuppoſe, that there is no reall hiſtoricall truth in the words, as they are in the Greek, and in the Latine Text. But truth there is, and though truth lie deep hid, *as in a well* (ſaid he of old;) yet, by Gods help, we ſhall winde her up, and draw her above ground, that every eye may ſee her, though we have many turnings.

3. Which that I may the better accompliſh, I muſt ſtraggle awhile after two moſt learned men, Cardinall Cuſanus, and Daniel Heinſius; eſpecially Heinſius; whom when I have overtaken, and wrung and wonne from him ſome holds, which are offenſive to the majeſtie of ſacred Scripture, then ſhall I return, and deſcend to the moſt difficult place of Acts 7. 16, &c.

The learned worthie Heinſius (whom I name not without honour, though I diſſent from him) in his Exercitations upon Nonnus, and in the *Prolegomena*, beats out certain paths, which never any on the earth trode upon, before him; pag. 27. making the Helleniſticall language to be the beſt interpreter of the Hebrew and Chaldee, and the Hebrew and Chaldee, interchangeably, the beſt interpreters of it.

[c] *Quod teſtimonium nec Hebraico textui, nec* 70 *Interpretibus convenire, me quoque tacente, perſpicuum eſt.*

[d] *Arbitror, Matthæum volentem arguere Scribarum & Sacerdotum erga divinæ Scripturæ lectionem negligentiam, ſic etiam poſuiſſe, ut ab iis dictum eſt.*

Before

Before all his words or my anſwer be recited, I think fit to premiſe theſe things:

Firſt, If Heinſius mean onely to extoll the knowledge of the Helleniſticall language, and of the Chaldee and Syriack; I aſſent unto him: nor ſhall any man, in right, aſcribe more to the holy mother of them all, and of all other languages, the primitive Hebrew, the language of God (when he ſpake audibly) and of Angels, unto men, then I will. Yet the pureſt gold may be over-valued, and the very ſhekel of the Sanctuarie thought heavier then it is. And indeed I ſhould be loath to ſay, what the moſt learned Cardinall Cuſanus hath written in his *Compendium, cap. 3. pag. 240.* [e] *It is not abſurd to beleeve, that the firſt art of ſpeaking was ſo copious, and full of many Synonymaes, that all the afterward-divided tongues were in it contained: For all languages are derived from our firſt parent Adams language. And as there is not a tongue which man underſtandeth not; ſo even Adam (who was no other then a man) could underſtand any language if he heard it: For he was the ὀνοματολόγος, who impoſed names upon the creatures; and therefore no word of any other language was originally inſtituted by any other. Neither are we to wonder at this in Adam, when it is certain, that by the gift of God many have ſuddenly obtained, and ſpeedily were inſpired with the skill and knowledge of all languages.* So farre Cuſanus.

That there is no language under heaven, but hath ſome words retaining the foot-ſteps of the Hebrew, I beleeve; and in the languages which I underſtand, I can demonſtrate: but that Adam could underſtand all languages now ſpoken, if he had heard them, is not credible. When God confounded their language, Geneſ. 11.7. &c. *the language of all the earth*, he did it to this end, that they might not underſtand one anothers ſpeech. The confuſion was not of inventing of new letters, vowels, and conſonants; for they are ſtill the ſame: and if there were ſeventie two languages, as ſay the Ancient, Hierom, Auguſtine, Proſper, Epiphanius; or but fiftie five, (as our Modern writers conjecture) anſwerable to their families, Geneſ. 10. yea two thouſand foure hundred languages more; they might all be uttered by the firſt two and twenty letters: Nor was it onely ſuch a confuſion, as when the ſweet ſinging of the nightingales is undiſtinguiſhable through the obſtreperouſneſſe of gagling geeſe, and chattering daws. For if at the beginning of that confuſion every one had ſpoken to another articulately and diſtinctly, *alternis vicibus*; they could not have underſtood, what either ſaid; though afterward by uſe, each familie underſtood themſelves, as we may dumbe men. But the confuſion conſiſted in this, That God took away from all, ſave the family of Heber, the habituall, or actuall knowledge of the Hebrew tongue; emptying the treaſuries of their memories, both ſenſi-

[e] *Nec abſurdum videtur, ſi creditur, primam dicendi artē adeò fuiſſe copioſam, ex multis Synonymis, quòd omnes poſtea linguæ diviſæ in ipſa continebātur. Omnes enim linguæ humanæ ſunt ex prima illa parentis noſtri, Adæ ſcilicet hominis, lingua. Et ſicut non eſt lingua quam homo non intelligit; ità & Adam (quia idē quod homo) nullam, ſi audiret, ignoraret. Ipſe enim vocabula legitur impoſuiſſe; ideo nullum cujuſque linguæ vocabulum ab alio fuit originaliter inſtitutum. Nec de Adam mirandum, cùm certum ſit, dono Dei, multos linguarum omnium peritiam ſubitò habuiſſe.*

ſenſitive and intellective, from all and every old note, impreſſion, character, figure, or ſpecies.

Secondly, when by an univerſall ἀμνησία, or oblivion, he had drowned or blotted out all former conceptions; he prompted readily unto them new forms, and furniſhed their intellectualls with new notions; which the pliable obedience of the tongue (at firſt not knowing what it ſaid) uttered in new words and languages; by the tranſpoſition and tranſ-changing, adding or diminiſhing of a letter, or letters. See Avenarius, drawing almoſt all Greek; and our Minſhaw, many languages from the Hebrew. But if they retained the ſame ſyllable, and the ſame word; yet in one language it ſignified one thing, and in another, another thing; as *ſus* ſignifieth, in the Hebrew, an *horſe*; with the Flaunderkins, *ſilence*; among the Latines, an *hogge:* as Cornelius à Lapide hath obſerved. Nor think I, that Noah (who lived at the confuſion of Babel; and was born within ſevenſcore yeares of Adams death) could underſtand all their languages, without much commerce, ſtudie, or divine revelation. Beſides all this, all ages have made and framed new words; nor is any time to be blamed,

——— *ſi nova rerum*
Nomina protulerit, ——— *If it coyn new names:*

it was lawfull, and is yet, — *dabitúrque licentia ſumpta pudenter, It ſhall be lawfull, ſo it be done modeſtly without enforcement*, ſaith Horace, *De arte Poetica.* And though there were but few yeares, about half a mans age, between the firſt and ſecond Punick warre; yet the articles of peace made at the end of the firſt warre, were hardly underſtood at the ſecond, as may be gathered from Polybius. What ſpeak I of words, when new languages have ſprung up, more then ever were at the confuſion of Babel? If God at the overthrow of Babel coyned or ſtamped the Greek; and if Adam could have underſtood it; were all its dialects diſtinguiſhed, or no? and the Helleniſticall Greek, or Grecanick language? (that I may uſe ſome of Heinſius his words.) And if thoſe were then ſpoken, and then intelligible; was the now common corrupt Greek misformed? or could Adam underſtand that, which Plato or Ariſtotle would ſweat to expound? If the Teutonick were then ſpoken; was the Saxon, Engliſh, Scotiſh, &c. (the derivatives from it, as Verſtegan and others will have it) then in uſe? If the Latine was framed in Babel; was it the firſt old blunt Latine, or the refined? If the refined; was the Valachian, Italian, Spaniſh, French, (the Provinciall tongues of Rome, if I may ſo call them) at that time ſpoken? I could be plentifull herein. But I paſſe unto the objections of Cuſanus, which ſhall receive this ſatisfaction in order.

Object. 1.

Object. 1. *The first art of humane speech was copious by many Synonymaes.*

I answer; The Hebrew had but few Synonymaes, few primitive Radixes, in comparison of other languages; many words signifying contrary things, every one divers things: nor did Adam speak any but Hebrew, nor needed he know any more. Cicero cried out of old,* *O word-wanting Greece!* and much more Judea, say I.

* *O inops verborum Gracia!*

Object. 2. *All languages came from the Hebrew which Adam spake.*

I confesse it, *quoad fundamenta sermonum, id est, quoad literas.* There were no new letters stamped or added to the first: but the tongues themselves came after divers descents: so that many languages now in use may acknowledge other mothers; though even those mothers were grand-children, or daughters of the Hebrew: neither of which, by reason of the long tract of time, and the insensible degrees of their growing, could know one another, if they could meet.

Object. 3. *As there is no language but some man understandeth, so there is no language but Adam, who signifieth a man, could understand if he heard.*

I answer, The word *Adam* is homonymous, and the similitude unlike, and disjoynted.

Object. 4. *But Adam imposed names on all things: therefore no man else originally invented any other name.*

I answer, He saith true, if he confine his meaning to the Hebrew, to that *Origo originans.* But that Adam called Cheese, *Coise*; or Cattell, *Catalla*; or a Chappel, *Capella*; a learned man should not think.

Object. 5. *Oh, but some, by Gods gift, had the knowledge of all tongues: then wonder not if Adam had.*

I answer, They had the gift of all tongues then necessarie to be spoken or understood; perchance of all tongues then in being: that as when people inclined to idolatrie, the diversitie of tongues was introduced; so when they were to be reconciled to Christ, the cloven tongues sitting on the Apostles, might finde a remedie for that diversitie, by the gift of languages. Yet saith Aquinas, 2^a. $2^{æ}$. quæst. 176. art. 1. ad 1. [f] *The Apostles were taught from heaven the languages of all nations, so farre forth as was requisite for the doctrine of faith; but for points of elegancie, the Apostles were onely skilfull in their own tongue. As in wisdome and knowledge they were sufficiently instructed, so farre as the doctrine of faith required; but they were not furnished* (saith he) *with acquisite knowledge, or conclusions Arithmeticall, or Geometricall.* Thus farre Aquinas. But that they understood or spake tongues which since have sprung up, is not likely: no more did Adam.

[f] *Instructi fuerunt divinitus in linguis omnium gentium, quantum requirebatur ad fidei doctrinam, &c.*

That

That Adam could have done it by Gods miraculous power, I confeſſe: that he could out-weather any meer man by his naturall gifts, I beleeve: what he could have done by labour or ſtudie in a little time, if he had heard or read any language, I will not queſtion; ſince man hath found out the language of Hieroglyphicks; and the tongue of characters hath been read; and if you place conſtantly ſeverall things in the room of ſeverall letters, a dog for A, a tooth for B, a lion for C, and the like; a little practiſe will diſcover the true meaning. But my controverſie with Cuſanus is, What Adam could do ſuddenly, naturally, and ordinarily, if he heard our mongrell Neoterick languages. He is for the affirmative, That Adam underſtood them, or could underſtand them. I am for the negative.

4. But I muſt return to Heinſius, with whom I will acknowledge, that the Orientall languages are of infinite worth, moſt neceſſarie to be ſtudied, exacting as much labour and pains before they be gained, as they afford delight and profit ſpirituall when they are obtained; yea, I heartily wiſh, that even the learned would not preſume to interpret the harder places of Scripture, unleſſe they be furniſhed with knowledge in the Eaſtern tongues: much leſſe ſhould the ignorant Laicks expound it. Thoſe beaſts ought not to touch this mountain.

That I may omit many memorable paſſages concerning the Old Teſtament, I ſay, that an unuſuall ſplendour from the Syriack, hath fully inlightned many places of the New Teſtament, which lay in darkneſſe. View two inſtances.

5. What was the meaning of *Anathema Maranatha*, 1. Cor. 16.22. was long unknown, long ſought after in vain; as being impoſſible to be found in the Greek or Latine languages, how copious ſoever: in the end, it was traced to be an Idiotiſme of the Syriack; and a phraſe borrowed from the uſance and practiſe of the Jews: for their politie had three ſorts of Excommunication. The firſt called *Niddui*, which regularly was a ſeparation for thirty dayes: during which time, the excommunicated perſon muſt keep himſelf foure cubits aloof from all men and women in all places. The Evangeliſt ſeemeth to touch at this, when he recordeth the Conſtitution of the Jews; that, *if any confeſſed Chriſt*, ἀποσυνάγωγος γένηται, *extra Synagogam fieret*, *He ſhould be put out of the Synagogue*, as the laſt Tranſlation well expounds it, Joh. 9.22.

The ſecond, and heavier degree was called *Cherem*; in the Greek Ἀνάθεμα: in the Latine, by the Livian phraſe, *Devotorius*; by the Ceſarean, *Devotus*. It were eaſie to mention ſome, who have vowed-away themſelves, as that reſolute young Romane Knight, Marcus Curtius, (ſee it in Livie *lib. 6.*) and the

ſoldurii

ſoldurii (from whence in likelihood cometh the name of *ſouldiers*) in Ceſars commentaries conditionally devoted.

—*Deciique caput fatale voventes;*
And the Decii vowing their own deſtruction.

Alſo, at ſeverall times and places, divers others, both captives and natives, have been dedicated to the infernall deities. To which, in the ſpirituall cenſure of Chriſtian Excommunication, there is ſome alluſion, where S. Paul delivered Hymeneus and Alexander unto Satan, 1. Tim. 1. 20. and 1. Cor. 5. 5. where he likewiſe decreed the like ſentence againſt the inceſtuous Corinthian.

The third and higheſt ſtep in this Excommunication, is called *Anathema Maranatha*, Μαρανάθα: for ſo ſome reade it in the Greek; alſo moſt of the Latine Bibles make it all one word, *Maranatha*; others, *Maranata*, ſaith Cornelius à Lapide. *What it did ſignifie,* [g] *the learned Divines long and much endeavoured to know: and all much laboured to finde the fountain and origination of that Anathema*, ſaith Bertram in the Preface on his compariſon of the Hebrew and Aramean Grammar. Elias, *in Thisb.* ſaith, MARA *ſignifieth* DOMINUS; and ſo the letter ן, is paragogicall: And *it may be read*, DOMINUS VENIT, *The Lord cometh*, ſaith Peter Martyr. Likewiſe for the language, *Some* (ſaith he) *think it is* [h] *one Syriack word.* [i] *Half Hebrew half Syriack*, as Cornelius à Lapide hath it. [k] *It is more Syriack then Hebrew*, ſaith Hierom, *Epiſt.* 137. *ad Marcel.* [l] *Though* (as he addeth) *it ſomewhat ſounds like Hebrew, by the nearenesſe and proximitie of thoſe languages.* In the perfect Hebrew, *Marennatha*, is, *Dominus noſter venit*, *Our Lord cometh.* ATHA is uſed Deut. 33. 2. אתה, *Et venit.* That MAR, MARA, or MARAN, is uſed for *Dominus*, till after the Babyloniſh captivitie, I reade not. What in the Hebrew is MORE, in the Chaldee is MAR; MAR *Dominus*; MARA or MARIA, *Domina. Some Chriſtians of the Eaſt at this day call their Prelates* MAR-ABRAHAM, MAR-JOSEPH, ſaith Cornelius à Lapide. Yea, *the whole ſentence is Chaldaick* (if ye beleeve the learned Eſtius:) *at large*, MARANA-ATHA; *contracted*, MARAN-ATHA. He alſo hath a wittie relation, That the Jews, before Chriſts coming, were wont ordinarily to have this word in their mouths, *Maran*, in expectancie of *Chriſt the Lord*; and on every occaſion with reference to him, MARAN, *Our Lord, He will come, he cometh*; MARAN, MARAN. But after Chriſt was born indeed, and God took on him our nature, and many Jews beleeved; whenſoever the unbeleeving brethren ſtill cried their old MARAN, as if the Meſſiah were not come; the beleevers anſwered, ATHA, to their MARAN; MARAN-ATHA, *Our Lord is come*: which becauſe the other would not beleeve, they were called *Marani*, and *Maranitæ*, from their iterated *Maran*, and rejecting of *Maran-atha*.

[g] *Viri doctos Theologos torſit.*

[h] *Una dictio Syriaca.*
[i] *Vox Hebræo-Syriaca.*
[k] *Magis Syrum eſt quàm Hebraum.*
[l] *Tametſi ex confuſio utrarumque linguarum aliquid & Hebraum ſonet.*

Baronius *in fine Anni* 775. reporteth from Mariana, in his Spaniſh ſtorie, 7. 6. That a gift was given to a Monaſterie; and the violatour of that donation, *jubetur eſſe Anathema, Marrano, & Excommunicatus.* Where the word is not taken (as ſome ſuſpect) *à Mauris, from the Moors*; becauſe moſt of them (in Italie) renounced their Chriſtianitie in the dayes of Frederick Enobarbus; for he reigned 360 yeares, and more, after that gift: but rather, *it is to be borrowed from the Syriack*, MARAN-ATHA, ſaith Mariana, commended by Baronius.

The conſideration of which curſe and excommunication, ſtrikes horrour to my ſoul, in compaſſion of thoſe who have raiſed their houſes out of the ruines of things ſacred with ſuch dreadfull imprecations, and feed themſelves fat with revenews properly belonging to the Altar. If man had not curſed ſuch ſacrilegious infringers, God would: but Founders have blaſted them with lightning and thunder from heaven. What ſaith King Stephen in confirmation of his gift to the Priorie of Eye in Suffolk, cited by M. Selden in his Hiſtorie of Tithes, *cap.* 11. *pag.* 350? *Whoſoever ſhall willingly and wittingly take away, diminiſh, or diſturb any one of all theſe things which are contained in this Charter: By the authoritie of God Omnipotent, the Father, Sonne, and holy Ghoſt, and of all the Apoſtles and Saints, let him be excommunicated and anathematized, and ſequeſtred from the companie of the Lord, and not be admitted into the Church till he repent.* By which words he intended to terrifie ſucceſsion, and to keep them from ſacriledge. Let the world know that there are many, and, as it falleth out now, too many ſuch direfull execrations annexed by holy Benefactours, to eternize their gifts: And as that good King ſaid of himſelf, That he was [m] *Willing to partake with them who by an happie commerce exchange earth for heaven*: So I fear, that the ſacrilegious Uſurpers have indeed exchanged *Heaven* for *Mammon*; and I pray to God that ſuch devout and deliberate maledictions hang not over their poſteritie to this day, nor may extend beyond the firſt Atheiſticall cormorants.

The ſame M. Selden in his book called *Marmora Arundelliana, pag.* 65. mentioneth a Chriſtian inſcription which (as he conjectureth) both prayed to the moſt holy Mother of God for ſuch as were Benefactours to a Monaſterie; and curſed them who did it any damage, with the imprecations of divers holy men; wiſhing, that whoſoever did ſo, might in the day of judgement have againſt him for an adverſarie the ſame moſt holy Mother of God. Theſe things I have related out of that moſt learned Antiquarie, my worthy friend M. Selden, rather then the like out of other Authours; becauſe I would not have either Clergie or Laitie conceit of him (as full many do) that he intended as great a devaſtation to our tithes con-

[l] *Quicunque aliquid de his quæ in hac charta continentur, auferre, aut minuere, aut diſturbare ſcienter voluerit; autoritate Domini Omnipotentis, Patris, & Filii, & Spiritûs Sancti, & ſanctorum Apoſtolorum, & omnium Sanctorum, ſit excommunicatus, anathematizatus, & à conſortio Domini, & liminibus Sanctæ Eccleſiæ ſequeſtratus, donec reſipiſcat.*

[m] *Volens partem habere cum iis qui felici commercio cæleſtia pro terrenis commutant.*

conſecrated by God and to God, by a double *Jus divinum*, as ever the Black-ſmiths ſonne brought upon Religious houſes; or that he was the inſtrument of ungracious Politicians; or his book the trumpet to animate the armies of the deſtroyers againſt the pitifull poore remnants of our Church, not enough (forſooth) as yet reformed; that is, not enough beggarly: though ſome poiſon in that book hath already wrought ſo piercingly upon us, that our hair is fallen from our heads, and our nails from our fingers, as needing no more paring; and in the caſes of our tithes we are ſhaved and cut worſe then the meſſengers of peace, 2. Sam. 10. 4. Yet ſaith M. Selden himſelf in his Review, pag. 471. *The many execrations annexed to the deeds of conveyance of them, and poured forth againſt ſuch as ſhould divert them to profane uſes, ſhould be alſo thought on:* Not onely thought on, ſay I, but trembled at, till the houre of reſtitution. And let them remember alſo who ſaith, That *it is a deſtruction for a man to devoure what is conſecrated*, Prov. 20. 25. which deſtruction is damnation; not cared for by our devouring Eſaus, if they may fill their bellies with our hallowed morſels; as appeared in thoſe whirl-winde-dayes of Henrie the eighth, and would have appeared ſince, if God had not ruled the heart of religious King James, of moſt happie memorie, and of our ſacred Soveraigne (to whom we of the Clergie do more eſpecially pray God to ſend all happineſſe, equall to his deſires on earth, and a more glorious eſtate among bleſſed Saints, then he hath now among men) to keep the commandments of their and our God, above any worldly benefit.

I muſt return back to *Maran-atha*; whoſe compoſition is thus, as Martyr opineth. The firſt part of it, is the Noun MARA: the ſecond is an affix of the poſſeſsive Pronoun, of the firſt perſon, with the number of multitude, making MARA to be MARAN: the third particle and the cloſe is the Verb ATHA, *venit*. Moreover, concerning the tenſe of the Verb there is queſtion. Chryſoſtom, Theodoret, Theophylact reade it *in tempore præterito*, ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν ἦλθε, *Our Lord is come*; with whom agree Hierom and Eſtius: others will have it to be the preſent tenſe; ſpeaking as if he did come preſently, becauſe he ſhall come certainly; and becauſe none can ſay, he ſhall not come at this preſent. This tenſe Cornelius à Lapide approveth, on this conſideration, becauſe the Jews condemning any were wont to do ſo, under the commination and conteſtation of the inſtant divine judgement, as Pſal. 9. 19. *Ariſe, O Lord, —let the heathen be judged in thy ſight:* or rather, ſaith Lapide, it may be in the Optative, MARAN-ATHA, *Veniat Dominus:* howſoever he is peremptorie, that it is a cold expoſition which applieth the words to the Preterperfect tenſe,

and the meaning to the firſt coming of Chriſt.

Let me adde, that whether the word be read in the Preſent tenſe in the Indicative, or in the Optative mood, *Venit*, or, *veniat*; *He cometh*, or *let him come*; it pointeth not at the paſt, but at the future coming of Chriſt. Yea, Jude 14. (where the word ἦλθεν is uſed) our Tranſlation hath it, *The Lord cometh*; and the words immediately following, make it to have apparent, and undeniable reference to the laſt judgement. Nor were the words *Maran-atha* taken from Moſes, Deut. 33. 2. though he ſaith, *The Lord came with* 11000 *of Saints:* where is a great ſimilitude of ſome particulars; for there is related what paſſed at the deliverie of the Law; and neither *Mara* nor *Maran* is mentioned; but rather by the ſemblance of words we may think Moſes alluded to the propheſie of Enoch, which long after this S. Jude citeth expreſly, as propheſying of future puniſhment to be inflicted for the breach of the Law. And indeed Ambroſe well expounds our *Maran-atha* of the ſecond coming of Chriſt: ſo Clemens Romanus, *Epiſt. 2. in fine.* Auguſtine *Epiſt.* 178 thus, *Anathema, condemnatus, Maran-atha, definiunt, Donec Dominus redeat; Condemned till the Lord return to judgement.*

Moſt true it is, *Maran-atha* is added, to exaggerate the power of the Execration, and that it is a form of Execration: ſo was it in the intent of the Donor in Mariana. The Talmudiſts ſay, it ſignifieth one delivered into the hand of the Tormentour, by the judgement of the Lord himſelf. Anſwerable it is in ſenſe, to the words in the 17. Chapter of the 6. Councel of Toledo; [l] *May he be perpetually anathematized*: and Chapter 18.[m] *Being ſtricken thorough with the divine curſe, without all hope of remedy let him be eſteemed damned by the eternall judgement.* Therefore indeed fooliſh were they, who thought *Anathema Maran-atha*, to be a kinde of oath; as if S. Paul adjured them, by the coming of Chriſt; yet ſo ſome held, ſaith Peter Martyr. More fooliſh was Cornelius à Lapide the Jeſuit, who on the place confeſſing the words to be [n] *Words of imprecation, of commination of the eternall damnation*; yea *words of condemnation*: acknowledging alſo, that *Maran-atha*, is *Anathema*, like to *Haſſchammata*, being uſually contracted to *Schammata*, which was generally known to be an excommunication of an high form; adding alſo, that [o] *Maranus and a man excommunicate for apoſtaſie are Synonymaes:* yet for all theſe things, by himſelf avouched, ſaith expreſly, [*] *They are not words of one that excommunicateth.* But indeed they are words of an excommunication, taken from the minatorie propheſie of Enoch, recited by S. Jude, verſe 14. *The Lord cometh*; [p] *From thence therefore every man ſeeeth that Anathema is deduced, and that according to the Hebrew guiſe it is called Anathema, from the beginning or firſt words of that curſe: which words*

[l] *Perpetuò Anathemate damnetur.*

[m] *Anathemate divino perculſus, abſque ullo remedii loco habeatur damnatus æterno judicio.*

[n] *Verba execrantis, & denuntiantis æternam damnationem, imò verba condemnantis.*

[o] *Maranus eſt idem, quod κάθαρμα, excommunicatus ob apoſtaſiam.*

[*] *Non ſunt verba excommunicantis.*

[p] *Indè ergò nemo non videt deductam illam Anathematis rationem, & ex primis illius Anathematis verbis, minùs aliàs ad alia aliarum ſententiarum initia uſitatis, Anathema ipſum de more Hebræorum appellatum fuiſſe.*

are

are otherwiſe leſſe uſed to the beginnings of other ſentences, ſaith the learned Bertram. *Maran-atha* is [q] *The higheſt and greateſt degree of excommunication among the Jews*, ſaith Druſius in his Henoch, pag. 29. who addeth, concerning the Apocryphall books of Henoch, that the Jews ſay, they have them yet, to this day. From whence it is likely, both that the Jews took their form of excommunication, and from the firſt words of the curſe, *Maran-atha*, might denominate the intire *Anathema*, *Maran-atha*: as from the beginnings of writs, or from the principall words, many of our Common-law-writs are ſo called aſwell as the decrees of Popes.

[q] *Extremum genus excommunicationis apud Hebræos.*

Nor let any object the unlikelihood, that this *Anathema* is taken from Enochs propheſie, becauſe S. Jude hath it not, like *Maran-atha*, κύριος ἦλθε, but ἦλθε κύριος. I anſwer, that neither Hebrew, nor Syriack, nor our Engliſh, ſo well endure the placing of the Verb before the Noun, as the Greek doth; but followeth naturally the naturall ſequele of the words: and not onely when Enoch ſpake it, but when S. Jude firſt wrote in the Syriack (if in it he wrote) that was *Maran-atha*, what after, by the Spirit was changed into ἦλθε κύριος: and the meaning is all one; whether it be κύριος ἦλθε, or ἦλθε κύριος, the Noun muſt be conſtrued before the Verb, *The Lord cometh*, *Maran-atha*. This excommunication S. Paul briefly and in two words reciteth, as an uſance of the Jewiſh Synagogue; and fit to be introduced into the Chriſtian Temples, and exerciſed in Eccleſiaſticall diſcipline. So much of that.

An other inſtance is in Act. 3. 21. What is in the Latine and Greek full of Amphibologie, diverſely, at divers editions, rendered by Beza and others, is plain, & radiant in the Syriack; Ὃν δεῖ οὐρανὸν μὲν δέξασθαι, *Quem oportet quidē cælum recipere*, ſaith the vulgat; *The ſentence is altogether doubtfull both in Greek and Latine*, ſaith Bellarmine, Tom. 1. pag. 409. whether *Jeſus ſuſcipiat cælum*, or *cælum Jeſum*, as Cajetan openeth the caſe. Now the Syriack, tranſlated by Tremellius, hath it, *Quem oportet cæli capiant*; *Quem neceſſe eſt cælis ut capiant*, as it is varied by the skilfull Linguiſt Bertram; *Quem oportet cælum ut capiat*, ſaith the Arabick; all running to the ſecond expoſition, that the heavens muſt contain Chriſt.

Which words being firm againſt the Ubiquitaries, they interpret *Cælum*, not properly, but figuratively, for the glorie, reigne, and majeſtie of God. [r] *For otherwiſe, if he had meant the place of Heaven, it would have been ſaid, Who muſt be received into Heaven:* So Illyricus, *in lib. de Aſcenſione Chriſti.* But Illyricus muſt not teach the holy Ghoſt how to ſpeak; nor be offended, if the All-wiſe Divine Spirit uſe an Amphibolous phraſe in the Greek, which is cleared by the more Eaſtern tongues. In my opinion, he might rather have ſaid, that, perhaps, by *Heaven*

[r] *Alioqui enim, ſi ſermo eſſet de loco, dictum eſſet, Quem oportet cælo recipi.*

God is meant; both becauſe our bleſſed Saviours laſt words were, Luke 23. 46. *Father, into thy hands I commend my Spirit*; which moſt certainly was received into the hands of his Father in heaven; as alſo, for that not onely the word *Cæli*, in the plurall number, is taken for God; according to the uſe of the Aramæans and alſo of the Jews; as appeareth in the record containing the jointure and dowrie which Rabbi Moſes made to Clarora, the daughter of Rabbi David, explained by Bertram, at the end of his Aramæan and Hebrew Grammar; where the Bridegroom ſaith (among other things) [t] *Be thou a wife to me according to the law of Moſes and Iſrael: and I according to Gods commandment will worſhip, honour, keep & govern thee:* ſomewhat according, as in our marriages, the husband promiſeth to worſhip, comfort, honour, and keep his wife: ſave onely that the Jew did promiſe to govern his wife, which we leave out: which is alſo conſonant to the authentick Hebrew, Daniel 4. 26. *Dominantes Cæli*, or *Cæli dominentur*, *The Heavens do rule*, as it is in our late Tranſlation; that is, *God in the Heavens doth rule*: But alſo becauſe (the Jews, in reverence and fear, avoiding the naming of *Jehova*, and calling him, among many other attributes, *Cælum*) our Saviour repreſenting in this hiſtoricall parable the perſon of a young penitent Jew, ſpeaketh as the Jew would, and placeth the word *Heaven* in the ſingular number for God. Luke 15. 18. *Father, I have ſinned againſt Heaven.* Likewiſe Matth. 21. 25. *The baptiſme of John, whence was it? from Heaven, or of men?* it is not *from Heaven*, or *from Earth*; but *from Heaven, or of men*; not a *place*, but *perſons* are to be underſtood; and in Heaven, rather God then Angels: and if likelihood lead us to expound it of Angels (as it doth not) yet thoſe Angels repreſented God, and were ſo called in his ſtead. And thus we will paſſe from this point.

[t] *Eſto mihi in uxorem, juxta legem Moſis & Iſrael; & ego, ex verbo Cælorum, colam, honorabo, alam & regam te.*

6. The ſecond thing, fit to be premiſed, is this. If Heinſius mean onely, that there are divers words, phraſes, and ſentences in the Greek Teſtament, which never were coyned, ſtamped, or allowed in Athens, as free-denizons of Greece; but are borrowed, and tranſlated from the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriack; no man will oppoſe him; and the exemplifying of it were eaſie and delightfull, if I had not made too large excurſions before, in a matter not much differing from this: But when he ſaith, They who were Jews by birth or generation, and withall did both know and ſpeak Greek, may be called *Helleniſts*; and that theſe Helleniſts, writing in Greek, much differed in language from the Heathen Grecians: As I deny it not in the generall; ſo ſome Jews there were, who, being wonderouſly well verſed in the Greek, wrote in Greek moſt politely: whence Philo Judæus was ſaid to Platonize; and Joſephus is ſtyled by Baronius, *The Greek Livius.*

Thirdly,

Thirdly, if Heinſius had onely ſaid, that S. John ſaw the Helleniſts; that S. John might have ſeen the paraphraſe of Onkelos; that the Chaldee Metaphraſe *Sanctiſsimo Joanni plurimis in locis placuit*; that S. John *ad Chaldaicam ſæpe alluſit interpretationem; quâ Judæi Aſiatici, ut olim, ità nunc utuntur*; all which he ſaith pag. 61. I would onely have wiſhed to ſee his proofs.

Fourthly, if Heinſius mean, that the Helleniſts onely, who were not inſpired from God, conceived in one tongue, what they did write; and wrote in another, what they conceived; I will ſubſcribe; and adde, that whatſoever they did ſpeak in Greek, they firſt had the notions of it in Syriack; and thence did, as it were, tranſlate their ſpeech, or writings; even (perhaps) Philo, and Joſephus, and ſuch as trafficked much with Greece, and Greeks: unleſſe among the Jews there might be ſuch a caſe, as was of Lord Michael de Mountaigne, who (as himſelf relateth in his Eſſaies, 1. 25.) being born a French man, yet never heard French, till he was above ſix yeares old; nor underſtood any word of his mother-tongue, no more then he did Arabick; becauſe he was brought up, where he heard no other language ſpoken, then Latine onely: and therefore long after, when he uſually ſpake nothing, but his Perigordin or French; yet upon great ſudden exigents, his conceits were firſt ſhaped in Latine; and his words brake forth, ere he was aware, in Latine, and not in French, as himſelf recordeth. So ſay I, if a Jew were thus brought up in the Greek, or in any other languages, his conceits might be the apprehenſions of his childiſh language, and not of that tongue which he uſed after.

Fifthly, and laſtly, if becauſe Heinſius himſelf is a daintie Critick, he will reduce the judgement of all Divinitie to Scriptures; of all Scriptures to Criticiſme; I will not contradict it, if we confine this judiciarie Cenſorſhip and Criticiſme to men skilfull and eminent in all arts, ſciences, and languages: for who can ſo well interpret Scripture, as ſuch men? It was a paſſionate conceit of hood-winkt men, as is recorded in the hiſtorie of the councel of Trent, lib. 2. pag. 122.[t] *When each man hath power to inquire into the tranſlation of the Scripture whether it be good or no; either comparing it with other interpreters, or conſulting with the Hebrew Text: then theſe new-ſprung pettie-Grammarians would make a confuſion of all things, and arrogate to themſelves alone the judgement and reſolutions in matters of faith.* And pag. 125. Almoſt all allowed the vulgat Edition, [u] *This made a powerfull impreſsion upon the mindes of the Prelates: becauſe it was ſaid Grammarians would aſſume to themſelves authoritie to direct and inſtruct Biſhops and Divines.* Wiſely, wiſely; as if Divines and Biſhops ought not to have been perfect Grammarians before they were Divines: As if both could not conſiſt together: As if famous and deep Divines had not been admirable, yea,

[t] *Poteſtate unicuique factâ in Scripturæ verſionem inquirendi, utrùm proba ſit, nécne, vel cum aliis interpretibus eam comparando, vel contextu Hebræo conſulto: tum novos boſce Grammaticaſtros omnia interturbaturos, & ſibi ſolis judicium & arbitrium in rebus fidei arrogaturos.*

[u] *In præſulum animos vehementi indè impreſſione factâ, quòd dicebatur, Grammaticos Epiſcoporum ac Theologorum inſtituendorum poteſtatem ſibi arrogaturos.*

the beſt and ſoundeſt of all Linguiſts and Criticks; whom they ſcornfully term pettie Grammarians: As if they envied any men theſe paſſages of learning, which they kenned not; and would put out the candle, which other men lighted; delighting rather in darkneſſe, then ſuffering ſome places, uſed by Popes and School-men, to be queſtioned and cleared: and it was a juſt indignation of the Friars againſt the Fathers, in the councel of Trent, becauſe they were ſo prompt to define Articles, and pronounce Anathemaes, when they did not well underſtand, and were loth to be taught the things themſelves, as it is in the Hiſtorie of the councel of Trent, lib. 6. pag. 481.

But ſince he ſaith of the Evangeliſt S. John, [x] *He alwaies had an eye to the Targumiſts*, pag. 289. and, [y] *He ſtill reſpecteth the Targumiſts*, pag. 250. and, [z] *All the words and ſpeech ſoundeth ſtrange*, pag. 230. as if there were not in S. Joh. one line, or phraſe, of pure good heathen Greek. Since he maketh the Helleniſticall Greek & the other Greek, divers languages, pag. 373. though they differ not ſo much as ſome Dialects, (beſides his jerk at Nonnus for his Grecanick, rather then Greek) adding to this effect, Prolegom. pag. 93. *Many have known ſuperficially the Helleniſticall tongue, but few the depth of it.* Since he reſteth not at this, ſaying, *It much mattereth to know, whether an Helleniſt expreſſe the Hebrew, or the Syriack in Greek; and whether he hath an eye to the Hebrew Text, or to the interpretations of the Grecians*; but addeth, [a] *All which unleſſe the Interpreter diſtinguiſh, he muſt needs loſe his labour.* And *he hath little knowledge, and no conſcience* (as Heinſius cenſureth) [b] *who dares tranſlate the Scripture, and thought not on theſe things*, Pag. 53. *Prolegom.* Whereby all the Primitive-Church, the Schoolmen, and late Writers, Interpreters or Tranſlatours, who knew not Hebrew from Syriack, are cenſured as unconſcionable ignorants. Since he proceedeth, avouching, *The knowledge of the New Teſtament* [c] *in vain ſhall you ſeek from the Grecians, becauſe both words and phraſes winde up to the Hebrew or Syriack.* And again, *The Greek Fathers* [d] *amazing the world with their abundant learning, have given document, that other things without the Hebrew are little worth:* Whence may be inferred, that the knowledge of the Greek in the New Teſtament is not to be found in the Greek Fathers, and that their labours have been of little worth: though ſome Greek Fathers knew the Eaſtern tongues better then Heinſius; as Origen, Theodoret, and others; and the moſt learned of them all in thoſe Eaſtern languages, to wit, Origen, was the worſt of them all in the interpretation of Scriptures. Since he proclaimeth in his *Prolegomena, Cùm plurima in novo fœdere à ſummis maximíſque hominibus ſunt præſtita, potißima pars ſupereſſe videtur*: Which is as much as if he had ſaid, All the world have not expounded the Greek Teſtament half well enough: or, not half of it well enough to this day: or,

[x] *Perpetuò ad Targumiſtas reſpexit.*
[y] *Ad Targumiſtas ſemper reſpicit.*
[z] *Totum λεκτικὸν, quod voces & ſermonem ſpectat, peregrinum eſt.*
[a] *Quæ niſi omnia diſtinguat, operam neceſſe eſt interpres ludat.*
[b] *Qui transferre ſacra audet, & de his non cogitavit.*
[c] *Fruſtra petas ex Græcis, quia ad Hebræam aut Syriacam dictio & voces exigendæ ſunt.*
[d] *Omni eruditione ad ſtuporem omnium inſtructi.*

or, the choiceſt, learnedeſt men have laboured much; but the beſt or chiefeſt things have they not cleared: as if they who well interpreted Hebrew with her Dialects in the Old Teſtament, had been faultie in their interpretations of the New Teſtament, becauſe they underſtood not, or reflected not up to the ſame Hebrew and her Dialects.

I ſay, in all theſe regards we muſt ſever from Heinſius; and leaving him to his ſingularitie, hold our ſelves to the generall expoſitions which Fathers, Councels, and the Church of God hath made of Scripture; till this more then *Doctor ſubtilis*, or *Doctor Seraphicus* (for they are by him rejected, as being wholly ignorant of the Hebrew, Syriack, or Helleniſtick Greek) give us better and more light. All which things I paſſe by with a touch onely, becauſe he hath one ſtrain of farre more both difficultie and moment. In which one point many are involved, and ſome of thoſe ſeldome or never handled.

His words are theſe in his *Prolegomena*, pag. 52. [e] *If one ask of me, In what language S. John wrote; I will ſay, He wrote as an Helleniſt: If one enquire in what language he conceived the things which he wrote; I will ſay, He conceived them in the Syriack tongue, and that he did bend the Greek, and winde up to the Syriack both the words and the ſayings, as is proper to the Helleniſts. Wherefore we muſt not have recourſe to the alluſions which now are, but we muſt look to them which S. John then conceived in his minde.* Yea, *Proleg. pag.* 49. he ſaith in generall, [f] *The Penmen of the New Teſtament conceived in one language what they wrote, and wrote in another what they conceived.* So he.

Such is the power and vertue of naked truth, that if we could ſee her as ſhe is in her ſelf, *Admirabiles ſui amores excitaret, She would make men wonderfully enamoured on her:* and ſuch is the ouglineſſe of errour and untruth, that they dare not appeare without masks, vizors, colours, fucuſſes; but go commonly trooping in the companie of truth or likelihoods. And ſo it fareth in theſe words of Heinſius; in which there are ſome truths mingled and ſhuffled together with ſome errours; which will eaſier be diſtinguiſhed by their ſeverall ranks and files, if we conſider and handle three *Lemmata*, or *Poſtulata*, *Reaſonable axioms* or *demands*, which I account as granted: ſeven Queſtions and five Concluſions directly oppoſing Heinſius.

7. The firſt *Poſtulatum* is this, That the inſpirations and conceptions of the ſacred Penmen, were divinely delivered under one or other language.

S. Baſil in Pſal. 28. ſaid remarkably, that *the intellectuall and inward conceits of the inſpired were after a wonderfull manner, as it were, figured and characterized.* S. Auguſtine, *de Geneſ. ad literam*, 12. 26. ſaith thus of the kinde of propheſying by ſpirituall viſion: [g] *If the ſoul be rapted from and above the*

[e] *Si quis ex me quærat, Quanam linguâ ſcripſerit Evangeliſta noſter S. Joannes; Helleniſticè ſcripſiſſe dicam: Si quis quâ conceperit, quæ ſcripſit; Syriacam fuiſſe dicam: Ad eam autem, quod eſt Helleniſtis proprium, & voces & ſermonē deflexiſſe Græcum. Quare ad alluſiones, non quæ extant, ſed quas animo conceperat, eundum eſt.*

[f] *Novi fœderis Scriptores linguâ conceperunt aliâ, quæ ſcriberent; aliâ ſcripſerunt, quæ conceperant.*

[g] *Si ab ipſis ſimilitudinibus rapiatur, ut in*

illam quasi regionem intellectualium & intelligibilium subvehatur, ubi sine ulla similitudine perspicua veritas cernitur, nullis opinionum falsarum nebulis obfuscatur; ibi virtutes animæ non sunt operosæ: ibi videtur claritas Domini, non per visionem significantem, sive corporalem, ut visa est in monte Sina; sive spiritualem, ut vidit Isaias, & Joannes in Apocalypsi; sed per speciem, non per ænigmata; quantum ea capere meus humana potest, secundum assumentis Dei gratiam, ut os ad os loquatur ei, quem dignum tali Deus colloquio fecerit; non os corporis, sed os mentis.

the phantasmes, so that it is elevated and carried, as it were, into that region of things intellectuall and intelligible, where without any phantasme or similitude apparent truth is seen, no clouds of opinion dimming it; there the faculties and powers of the soul are not turmoiled or painfully busied: there the brightnesse or excellencie of the Lord is seen, not by any typicall or corporall vision, as it was seen in mount Sina; or spirituall, as Isaiah saw, and S. John in the Revelation: but plainly and directly, not darkly or in riddles, so farre as the minde of man can conceive, according to the grace of the indulgent Lord, so lifting up the soul, that he speaks face to face to him whom the Lord makes worthy of such a conference: Understand the face or mouth, not of the body, but of the minde.

Dionysius, *cælestis Hierarch. cap.* 1. somewhat otherwise: [h] *It is impossible that the divine light should otherwise shine upon us, then clouded and surrounded with varietie of sacred vails and coverings.* For humane understanding cannot conceive the very bare and naked intelligible truth her self, without conversion to the *Phantasmata*; therefore things propounded to men by God or Angels, are propounded under sensible similitudes, and resemblances not meerly incorporeall: I say, *by God, or Angels*; for howsoever Dionysius *cap.* 4. *de divinis nominibus, part.* 1. *aliquantulum ante medium*, saith, [i] *All divine irradiations are brought unto men by the interposition or help of Angels:* and Gregorie, *Dialog.* 4, 5. [k] *In this visible world nothing can be ordered, but by the invisible creature:* yet I would be loath peremptorily to exclude Gods immediate operation or illumination; but rather conclude, That all intellectuall irradiation of men, either by God immediately, or by Angels, is by known *species*.

[h] *Impossibile est aliter nobis lucere divinum radium, nisi varietate sacrorum velaminum circumvelatum.*

[i] *Omnes divinæ illuminationes perferuntur ad homines mediantibus Angelis.*

[k] *In hoc mundo visibili nihil, nisi per creaturam invisibilem, disponi potest.*

Basil on Isa. 7. 3. [l] *I think that the Prophets received not the word of God by sensible hearing, by the corresponding help and conformation of the aire: but since the intellective soul hath its proper kinde of eares or hearing, what was spoken from above and from God, came to their knowledge and notice without any bodily voice.* See Aquin. *part.* 1. *quæst.* 210. *art.* 1.

[l] *Arbitror Prophetas nequaquam percepisse Verbum Dei sensili auditu, per conformationem aëris: sed quando animæ intellectu præditæ, suæ suppetunt aures, quæ à superuis nuntiabantur, citra ullam corporis vocem, ad eorum pertingebant notitiam.*

In all three kindes of oracles, by which God speaketh to men (the Externall, the Imaginarie-spirituall, the Spirituall-intellectuall) there are some *species* or other intercurrent between God inspiring and inlightning, and man apprehending or conceiving. Though where Fulgentius saith truly, that in divine inspiration, [m] *Without the sound of words or elements of letters, the truth speaketh so much the sweeter, by how much the secreter*, is rightly inferred; that there is no outward sound; yet there is an intellectuall *loquitur* of the Spirit to our inward man; and it attempereth and mouldeth it self to the capacitie, abilitie, and habituall *species* of the part recipient, that is, our understanding; or frameth our understanding to it.

[m] *Sine sonis sermonum & elementis literarum, eò dulciùs, quo secretiùs, veritas loquitur.*

Men

Men may be taught new languages on a ſudden, and underſtand as ſuddenly things before unknown; but to conceive without ſome kinde of word, is above conceit. God himſelf cannot be conceived by men, but by ſimilitudes of things corporeall; and, perhaps, even Angels cannot conceive of him but under ſome ſhadow: for a finite thing cannot comprehend an infinite eſſence, but onely according to its model. An infinite thing onely can comprehend infinitie as it is in it ſelf.

When the Spirit of God immediately ſpeaketh to the ſpirits of men, though the irradiation be ſpirituall and intellectuall, yet it is ſhaped to the habits of knowledge acquired. Infuſed notions muſt be proportionable to acquired, actuall, to habituall; all homogeneall, not heterogeneall; having affinitie, and holding correſpondent intelligence with the *ſpecies* received. [n] *Whatſoever is received, is received according to the meaſure, power, or facultie of the receiver,* is a true ground, and ſound maxime, as well in Divinitie as in Philoſophie.

[n] *Quicquid recipitur, recipitur ad modum recipientis.*

There is not an higher illumination then was that of S. Paul: yet was there in him, and in all others, ſomewhat *loco ſigni & vocis, in the room or ſtead of the ſigne, voice, or ſpecies.* 2. Cor. 12.4. *I heard unſpeakable words,* (yet words ſpoken) *which it was not lawfull* (or poſſible) *for a man to utter:* yet to him they were uttered; and it is not certain that he was bodily rapt into the third heaven.

Auguſtine, *de Geneſ. ad liter.* 12.27. diſcourſing of Gods ſpeaking to Moſes, Numb. 12.8. *Os ad os loquar ad illum, in ſpecie, & non per ænigmata; I will ſpeak to him face to face, apparently and plainly, not by riddles or obſcurities,* ſaith, *This is not to be underſtood according to the bodily ſubſtance preſented to the eyes of the fleſh; for ſo he ſpake to Moſes face to face, when Moſes ſaid, Oſtende mihi temetipſum, Shew me thy ſelf:* and addeth, [o] *But in that way, and in that form as he is God, he ſpeaketh ineffably, more ſecretly, more home and cloſe to the purpoſe, more nearely preſent with words unſpeakable.* And in the Chapter following he ſaith, *The ſpeaking mouth to mouth was* [p] *by ſuch a ſpecies, by which God is whatſoever is: howſoever the minde of man which is not as God, cannot conceive him without bodie or bodily ſimilitude:* where ſtill he maketh a kinde of not-ſpeaking ſpeech, or of ſpeaking non-ſpeech, according to the capacitie of man.

[o] *Illo ergò modo, in illa ſpecie quâ Deus eſt, longè ineffabiliter ſecretiùs & præſentiùs loquitur locutione ineffabili.*

[p] *Per ſpeciem ſcilicet, quâ eſt Deus quicquid eſt: quantulumcunque eum meus, quæ non eſt quod ipſe, &c.*

The ſecond *Lemma* is this, That the holy Actuaries, or Writers of the Divine Scripture, could not erre in their conceptions.

Auguſtine, *de Geneſ. ad liter.* 12.25. proveth daintily in generall, that our outward and inward ſenſes may be deceived; when onely the intellectuall viſion is certain, and is not deceived: [q] *Either it underſtandeth, and then it is true; or if it be not true,*

[q] *Aut enim intelligit, & verum eſt; aut, ſi non eſt verum, non intelligit.*

true, it underſtandeth not. As the aire is enlightened by the reſplendent rayes of the ſunne, ſo was their intellect by ſupernall, bright, unfailing irradiation; which beam of divine light wrought theſe two effects: Firſt, that they knew certainly it was God who ſpake unto them: Secondly, that they could not miſconceive or take awry in an erring ſenſe the things inſpired: which illumination may be called *Guſtus Dei, The taſte of God*, Pſal. 34. 8. *The wheels with ſtrakes full of eyes round about them*, Ezek. 1. 18. *Cloven tongues like as of fire*, Act. 2. 3. *As it were,* a ſixth ſenſe leading to knowledge*, as Clemens *Recognit. lib.* 2. termeth it: *A joyfull ſound, the light of Gods countenance*, Pſal. 89. 15. *In thy light we ſhall ſee light*, Pſal. 36. 9. *A burning and a ſhining light*, Joh. 5. 35. *A marvellous light*, 1. Pet. 2. 9. *Sol ſpiritualis, An intellectuall ſunne: Sapor, a ſavour or taſte; which Monica could not expreſſe by words*, as her ſonne relateth, *Confeſſ.* 6. 13. *Intimus ſapor*, ſaith Gregorie, *Dialog.* 4. 4. *Intimus ſapor & experimentalis illuminatio, A moſt inward reliſh, and experimentall illumination*, as Gerſon ſtyleth it: *Columna ignis, A pillar of fire*, Exod. 13. 21. *Stella Magos in Oriente antecedens, The ſtarre conducting the wiſe men of the Eaſt*, Matth. 2. 9. *An holy, undeceiving, unambiguous influent coruſcation: The Spirit of God moving upon the face of the waters*, Gen. 1. 2. This made Abraham not unwillingly to ſacrifice his ſonne. The quenching of this Spirit againſt the cleare light of his own convicted conſcience, made the old Prophet more inexcuſable then the other officious lying Prophet, who deceived him, 1. Kings 13. 16, &c. Nor did an Angel ſpeak unto the ſeducer by the word of the Lord, verſ. 18. Samuel being but a childe might not indeed, as a novice; or ſome others, for a while, might not know the voice of the Lord: as Peter at the preſent knew not the operation of God by the Angel, in his miraculous deliverie: *But now I know* (ſaith he) *that God hath ſent his Angel*; yea, *I know of a ſurety*, Act. 12. 11.

* *Sextus ſenſus prænoſcendi.*

Profane ones I will not priviledge from miſtaking of God: as perhaps, leſt Satan might out-ſtretch his Commiſsion from God, when he gave Job into his hands, God ſaid reſtrainingly, *Onely ſave his life*, Job 2. 6. And S. Auguſtine, *de cura pro mortuis gerenda, cap.* 12. telleth an admirable ſtorie of two men, each called *Curma*; to wit, How Curma the Countrey-man lay almoſt dead many dayes: onely, a little ſteam of breath coming from him, they kept him from buriall, though he was without motion, or any feeling, whatſoever they did unto him; in which time he ſaw many viſions: So ſoon as he opened his eyes, he ſaid, *Let one go to the houſe of Curma the ſmith.* Who was found dead that moment in which Curma the Husbandman came to his ſenſes. And the ſurviving Curma related, that he heard in the place from whence he was returned, that

the

the ſmith, and not himſelf, was to be brought to that place. A miſtaking there was by the meſſengers of death, though it were after righted. Caiaphas might not know the inſpiration or inſtinct prophetical which he had; becauſe he was a wicked man: *Diſpenſativè illi contigit ſermo, He did diſtribute the ſpeech to others, which he knew not himſelf*, ſaith Baſil *in Proœm. Iſaiæ.* He was a Prophet *perchance*; *Caſu*, ſaith Origen on John. Balaam his aſſe and Caiaphas ſpake they knew not what. *The propheſie was tranſitorie*, ſaith S. Auguſtine. Wherefore I conclude, as before, That wicked men may be puniſhed with miſtakings in things divine. But that ever any holy man was ignorant to the end, that God moved when he moved him; or that the righteous were ever deceived by Oraculous, anfractuous perplexities; or that the Notaries of heaven, the writers of any part authentick of either Teſtament, could be deceived in their conceptions, is not agreeable to likelihood, reaſon, or truth.

The laſt *Lemma* is this, The holy Penmen could not erre in writing.

If they could, what difference is there between their Writings, and other profane Authours?

And to what end had they infallibilitie of underſtanding, if what they underſtood they could expreſſe erroneouſly?

A readie, perfect, and quick ſcribe writeth not falſly; but, *My tongue is the pen of a readie writer*, ſaith the Pſalmograph, Pſal. 45.1. Holy Ezra, who was the divine *amanuenſis* of the book of Ezra, is called by the ſame words, SOPHIR MAHIR, *a readie, ſwift, exact ſcribe*, Ezra 7.6. no queſtion, with alluſion to the words of the Pſalmiſt.

John 16.13. *When the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth.* How into all truth, if there be an errour in writing? Or, had God care that the Apoſtles ſhould not miſſe of the truth in their Speeches, and yet miſſe in their Writings?

If the Prophets could not erre, no more could the Evangeliſts or Apoſtles: for, if there were any ſuperioritie in priviledge, we are rather to aſcribe it to theſe latter, then to thoſe former; in regard that the Law of Chriſt and of Grace, is farre above the Law of Moſes, as the Apoſtle doth demonſtrate to the Hebrews themſelves. But that the Prophets could not erre is apparent, becauſe Chriſt himſelf, who is Truth, would not have appealed from the preſent more viſible pretending Synagogue, to them as all-ſufficient Judges (as he often did) if they could erre. A perfect rule is not to be tried by an imperfect one. Prophets writ their Propheſies, and faſtened them to the gates of the Temple, and other publick places, to be read: and were rather judged by their Propheſies written, then by them as inſpired or uttered by mouth.

The *Gnomon* of the Sunne-diall, which our late Hieroglyphical Poetaſter doth make to ſignifie the Scriptures, is better to be judged by a moving clock, the curious handie-work of the ſame great Artiſt (I mean, by the Church, and Churchmen; with whom Chriſt hath promiſed his Spirit ſhall be to the end of the world) then by the rude maſons, or rather the ſenſeleſſe ſtones and mortar of the walls, (I mean the ignorant people) who have plucked down not onely the Weather-cock (by his interpretation, the Pope) but uſurp to themſelves a power to judge the *Gnomon*; and to reform and amend the well wrought, well ordered clock. The ſhallow phantaſtick ſtateth not the queſtion aright, when he is ſo magiſterially peremptorie; ſaying, *That the Clergie may not ſo judge of the Scriptures, as to conclude or teach any thing againſt them; or to vouch unwritten verities* (if they be certain verities, it matter-eth not much whether they be written or unwritten: Veritie will vouch it ſelf in ſpight of lying Poets) *as ſome call them, or Traditions contradictorie to the written Word:* Which contradictorie Traditions do much differ from unwritten Verities, howſoever the Poet confuſedly joyneth them. For, who of us ever taught that the Clergie may teach any thing againſt the Scriptures? when we profeſſe with him, that the Church ought to ſubject it ſelf to be directed by the Scriptures. But that fabling rymer may ſay any thing, who in his *Sarcaſmos* and Frontiſpice is ſuffered thus to rave,

No wonder that the Clergie would be Kings:

whereas we the now unpriviledged Clergie, do humbly pray to God to uphold our declining eſtates from the hands of thoſe Atheiſts, and turbulent Anti-epiſcopall, Anti-monarchicall Reformiſts; perhaps Penſioners of the forein enemies of our State, who, under the pretence of Religion, labour to pluck down our Church and Eccleſiaſtick Hierarchie; and upon the ruines thereof to ariſe to the depluming of the Eagle; to the bearding of the Lion; not onely to the paring of the royall prerogative, but alſo the removing the very ſcepter and crown from the Anointed of the Lord, (whom God alwaies mightily defend!) and to the bringing in of popular government: for, *No Biſhop, no King*, ſaid the learned, wiſe, and pious King James, moſt truely.

I return to retort the Church-reforming Poets words upon himſelf: In his Solarie he ſaith, That the diall is the Written Word, which is of it ſelf dead and unprofitable, without further illumination; ſince none of the Philoſophers, nor Solomon himſelf, by the meer ſtrength of Nature, could from thence draw ſaving knowledge without ſaving grace. The queſtion is not, Whether the Scripture or Church ſhall be Judge; but, Whether the Clergie or Laitie ſhall be Interpre-

ters

ters of this dead word, and unprofitable without further illumination. We bid not the people to pluck out their eies, that they may be led by us, as the Jeſuites and Popiſh Prieſts do; neither do we like the other extream of the people, preſuming that they can give better anſwer then the Ephod, the Urim and the Thummim; and over-ſee the Seers, who ought (by the expreſſe commandment of God himſelf) to have the overſight of them, Heb. 13.7. But they are to reſt contented with the generall Commiſſion given to the Miniſterie, *He that heareth you, heareth me*; eſpecially in things (as moſt things are) above their capacitie. But the people will expound Scriptures, contradict their Paſtours, cenſure their labours, judge their Judges, even in matters of ſuch ſpeculation as they may moſt ſafely be ignorant of; and, under pretence of deſire to have their conſciences well informed, will not be informed at all in any thing againſt their humours and fancie; but monopolize the Spirit to themſelves, and yeeld no more in this point to the ordinance of God, who hath committed to us the word of reconciliation, then to the very devils, whom they are bound to beleeve and follow, in all things wherein their conſciences are well informed.

My former task recalleth me. Bezaleel and Aholiab both did and could work all manner of work for the ſervice of the Sanctuarie, *according to all that the Lord had commanded*, Exod. 36.1. Had God more care of his Sanctuarie, then of the Church of Chriſt? Or could God command an untruth, when he guided the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts as powerfully, if not more then ever he did the workmen of his Sanctuarie? Or had the Penmen leſſe grace or goodneſſe then the workmen? Certainly they had, if they ſwarved in writing from what was commanded by God. Moſes was admoniſhed of God, when he was about to make the Tabernacle; *See* (ſaith God) *that thou makeſt all things according to the pattern ſhewed thee in the mount*, Hebr. 8.5. which the Apoſtle borrowed from Exod. 25.8, &c. where God giveth this charge, *Let them make me a Sanctuarie —according to all that I ſhew thee, after the pattern of the Tabernacle, and the pattern of all the inſtruments thereof, even ſo ſhall ye make it.* So, and no otherwiſe; not ſo much as a little nail or peg ſhall make any difference. And ſhall we think, that the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles might ſwarve in writing from what was delivered unto them?

That Chriſt himſelf could and did reade, is proved Luk. 4. 16. That he could and did write is plain, John 8.6, &c. That he ever wrote any part of his doctrine, of the Law of Grace, of our Scripture, is not evident: for though Baronius, *ad annum Chriſti* 31. ſaith, That many of the Ancients beleeved that our bleſſed Saviour wrote an epiſtle unto Abagarus, or Abgarus,

Prince of Edeſſa; yet ſince Salianus wholly balketh this ſtorie, (which he would not have done, if there had been either truth or likelihood in the matter; becauſe of the miracles mentioned by Baronius, wrought by the image of our Saviours face, which himſelf ſent to the ſame Prince) let us eſteem it as a thing unworthy of belief. That whatſoever Chriſt did, he did both well and conveniently; and whatſoever he omitted, he alſo omitted well and conveniently, I take for moſt certain: and yet, if he had done ſomething which he omitted, I dare ſay he had alſo done well and conveniently: and I ſhould be afraid to ſay, That it was not convenient for Chriſt to write any part of Scripture therefore, becauſe perſonally he wrote none. *It was convenient for others, and not for Chriſt himſelf, to write his own doctrine* (ſaith Aquin. 3. *part. quæſt.* 42. *art.* 4.) *for the excellencie both of the Teacher, and of the doctrine*; which he confirmeth thus, *The moſt excellent way was, to imprint his doctrine in their hearts: So did Chriſt teach,* As Having Power, *Matth.* 7. 29. *and Pythagoras and Socrates, the excellenteſt teachers among the Gentiles, would write nothing. For the Scripture is ordained to imprint doctrine in the hearts, as to an end. Moreover, if Chriſt had written his own doctrine,* [q]*men would never have had an higher eſteem of his doctrine, then of that which might ariſe from things contained in Scripture.* Thoſe are the words of Aquin. Much of this is but meer froth, and the ſhadow of reaſon, unfitting the pen of ſo Angelicall a Doctour; who remembred not that God himſelf wrote the Law; and that God did write the Law in ſome mens hearts, as well as in ſtone, Hebr. 8. 10. and ſo might Chriſt in both, if he had pleaſed. As for Pythagoras and Socrates, if they wrote nothing, yet their words made no deeper impreſſion upon the hearts of their auditours, then the writings of many other men have done upon the hearts of their readers. Moreover, ſome have thought that Pythagoras and Socrates were not the excellenteſt teachers among the Gentiles; Ariſtotle and Plato are eſteemed their equals; and ſome have preferred Hermes Triſmegiſtus and Homer before both of them. Indeed the Scripture was ordained to imprint doctrine in the heart; was it therefore inconvenient that Chriſt himſelf ſhould write? His ſpeech was ordained to imprint his doctrine in their hearts, as to an end; yet was not his ſpeech inconvenient: no more inconvenient had been his writing; yea rather more convenient (if ſo it had pleaſed him) becauſe many of his words reached but to a few; but his writings might have reached to many millions of places and perſons more, and might have been everlaſting. To conclude, If the Jews looked through the vails, types, and ſhadows of Moſes Law, to the more ſpirituall things of Chriſt; then certainly, if Chriſt had writ

[q] *Nihil altiùs de ejus doctrina homines æſtimarent, quàm quod Scriptura contineret.*

writ his doctrine, we would not esteem of him according to the letter onely of that doctrine; but we would think (as we ought) that either he wrote not all, or wrote onely such things as were fit for us to know, or as we could understand; reserving more secret, deep, and divine things to himself. For reasons best known to himself, he baptized not any, no not his own Apostles. For reasons best known to himself, he wrote not immediately any part of Scripture. To say it was not convenient because Christ did it not, inferreth that Christ was bound to do all things convenient; yea, and which man judgeth convenient; and what he did not do was not convenient.

God might have bettered, and may yet better some of his own works, though they be very good: Shall we conclude, that because he did not, therefore it was not fit he should have done so? God did not say at the end of the second dayes work particularly and expressely, *It was good*, or *God saw that it was good*; as he did at all and every of the other five dayes creation: Was it therefore not good? Yes verily; for Gen. 1. 31. *God saw every thing that he had made, and behold, it was very good.*

John 14. 16, &c. *The Comforter shall abide with you for ever: even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him; but ye know him: for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.* And verse 26. *The Comforter shall teach you all things:* Therefore he shall teach them to write truely: the Spirit of truth will not suffer them to write falsly whilest he dwelleth with them, and in them; as he did when they wrote.

Inspiration was ordained as a cause, and as a means of right conceiving: conceiving or apprehension was appointed as a cause and a means of right expression: expression was either by word or writing. Many words were prophetically and most divinely spoken, which were not written; not so many were written, as were first spoken: The vocall expression was more transient and transitorie; perhaps, concerning some few, and those onely of those times: the expression permanent, and by writing, was and is directorie to mankinde to the end of the world. Inspiration, apprehension, and much expression by voice, were all as means to this main end, that there might be a Scripture. Shall the means be certain, unerring, and inerrable; and shall the end be dubious, crooked and erring? The perfect use of the right means leads on infallibly to an undeceiving and exact end: If the Divine Penmen could not erre or be misled in the former, which sometimes vanished, leaving no footsteps behinde them; it is not possible that they should erre in writing, which is the master-

piece of that divine work, laſting for ever; the abſolute ſquare, and judge, and canon of all mens thoughts, words, and deeds; unleſſe you ſay, God had leſſe care to preſerve from corruption divine records filed up on eviternitie, and neceſſarie at all times, for all perſons, in all places (as the Scriptures now are) then he had of inſpirations: which ended onely in the apprehenſion, if they were not expreſſed; or turned into aire, and vaniſhed almoſt with the breath, if they were onely ſpoken.

Nor let any man ſay that writing is further removed from the divine operation, then inſpiration was, and ſo more ſubject to errour: for it ſhall appeare ere long, that the ſame Spirit which began by inſpiration, ſat, ſtill moving on the waters, not leaving his own work till there was a perfect production, till the end was accompliſhed, and the will of God was written in words and letters of truth; ſo that not one Iota or tittle had any errour. Yea, let me go one ſtep further, and ſay, that when the Apoſtles did dictate to their ſcribes, actuaries, or ſecretaries, not onely not themſelves, but not their notaries could erre.

And yet I have read of two mad ſtories croſſe to my opinion: the one in Sixtus Senenſis, *Bibliothecæ ſanctæ*, 2. *pag.* 120. on the name *Tertius:* who recordeth out of Diodorus Biſhop of Tarſus, that this Tertius, being no excellent ſpeaker nor writer, made the obſcure Epiſtle of S. Paul to the Romanes to be more obſcure, whileſt he laboured to expreſſe S. Pauls thoughts and ſenſe, by more confuſed and unabſolute ſentences, and tranſpoſed explications. As if S. Paul could not write ſufficiently himſelf: though he ſaid (in humbleneſſe) *Rudis ſermone ſum, I am rude in ſpeech*, 2. Cor. 11. 6. yet was he *powerfull in writing*, 2. Cor. 10. 10: As if he had not divers moſt ſufficient ſcribes by him: As if he would permit the writing of ſo divine, ſuper-divine an Epiſtle to an Ignaro, a ſilly fellow: As if Tertius himſelf wrote not this Epiſtle *in the Lord*, that is, *by divine authoritie*, or (as Cajetan thinketh) theſe words, *In the Lord*, are added to ſhew that he did not write it as an hireling: which ſenſe is made good by ſome authorities, according to the diverſitie of punctation: As if the Spirit who inſpired Paul dictating, ruled not the hand of Tertius writing: As if S. Paul would make ſo block-headed a diſciple as Tertius is feigned to be, to be his ſcribe, and that in his moſt majeſticall and obſcureſt Epiſtle: Or if Tertius were ſo, that he ſhould be thought worthy to be *Iconii Epiſcopus*, and have that extraordinarie grace to be crowned with Martyrdome; as Eccleſiaſticall hiſtorie recordeth of him: As if S. Peter (whom Paul *withſtood* for a ſmaller matter *to the face*, Gal. 2. 11.) when he ſaid that there were in all S. Pauls Epiſtles

ſome

ſome things hard to be underſtood, would have commended his fellow-Apoſtles wiſdome, as he did, 2.Pet.3.15. and not rather have found fault with his follie, and the manner of his writing, if not with the matter alſo, if Tertius had been ſo abſurd as Diodorus imagined; eſpecially ſeeing S. Peter ſaith, that the unlearned and unſtable wreſt ſome of thoſe writings unto their own deſtruction: which in all likelihood ſhould juſtly rather ſwallow up S. Paul for his careleſneſſe of inditing, and Tertius for his ſupineneſſe, or rather blaſphemous forgerie of divine truths by miſ-writing them, if any fault could have been truely imputed to either of them. But of this we ſhall ſpeak (by Gods help) more at large in the next ſection ſave one.

The ſecond mad ſtorie followeth. Becauſe ſome were wont to forge Epiſtles in S. Pauls name, (as is apparent 2. Theſſ.2.2.where he beſeecheth them, *Not to be ſhaken in minde, or to be troubled, neither by ſpirit, nor by word, nor by letter, as from us*) therefore he alway ſubſcribed his own name to all his Epiſtles, [t] *Whereſoever he knew that there were falſe teachers*, ſaith Hierom on Gal. 6.11. On which place he alſo relateth, that a very learned man of thoſe times ſaid, S. Paul being an Hebrew knew not Greek letters: and becauſe neceſsitie required that he ſhould ſubſcribe with his own hand to the Epiſtle, [u] *He wrote, though in ill-ſhaped, unhandſome, very great letters:* ſhewing this teſtimonie of a kinde affection, that he would endeavour to do for the Galatians what indeed he could not do. Whereby he concludeth, that S. Paul could not write Greek, at leaſt, not in a legible good hand. S. Hierom wondered at the ridiculouſneſſe of his expoſition (as well he might) becauſe the Apoſtle uſed to ſubſcribe to divers of his Epiſtles, and here he wrote this whole Epiſtle with his own hand: and yet S. Hieroms expoſition is almoſt as forced as the former: [w] *S. Paul* (ſaith he) *wrote in large long characters or letters, becauſe the ſenſe was great in the words, and was written by the Spirit of the living God, and not with penne and ink.* For though the ſenſe and words of this Epiſtle to the Galatians be from God, and moſt divine; yet there is no reaſon to imagine, that S. Paul intended to include that ſenſe under theſe words, *Videte*, or *Videtis qualibus literis ſcripſi vobis manu meâ*; *You ſee how large a letter I have written to you with mine own hand.* But if the word μηλοις, doth ſignifie quantitie; though S. Paul wrote in great letters and characters, yet it might be a verie good and fair hand: as there are few fairer writings then ſome where the letters are large and full drawn: and I doubt not but he who gave them the extraordinary gift of tongues and languages did alſo, as a neceſſarie appendant, give them the power to write well thoſe lan-

[t] *Ubicunque ſciebat falſos adeſſe doctores.*

[u] *Contra conſuetudinem curvos tramites literarum vix magnis apicibus exprimebat.*

[w] *Grandibus Paulus literis ſcripſit, quia ſenſus erat grandis in literis, & Spiritu Dei vivi, non atramento & calamo fuerat exaratus.*

guages; eſpecially ſince their writings were to benefit more then their voices could reach unto. We never reade that the holy Apoſtles, Peter, James, or John, were learned; or could reade or write before their calling; or learned it by degrees after their Apoſtleſhip: yet they could and did write; and as the Spirit guided their thoughts and words, ſo did he their hands; and they wrote both divinely for matter, and (as I think) exquiſitely for the manner; yea, more exquiſitely then other men, as being governed and actuated by the hand of God, which is perfect in all his works. And indeed the true ſenſe of the place (in my opinion) toucheth not at the deformedneſſe of the characters, or at the grand-greatneſſe of them; but at the length or prolixitie of the Epiſtle: which is excellently rendered by our Engliſh, *You ſee how large a letter I have written*; as if S. Paul had ſpoke thus, more at large; *I who before told you that we muſt not be weary of well-doing, but muſt do good unto all men whileſt we have time, eſpecially to the houſhold of faith; I ſay, I my ſelf have not been wearie in writing this Epiſtle, though it be long: and whileſt I had time, I have ſpent that time in doing you good, by writing this letter, by writing this long and large letter to you. For though I have written longer Epiſtles, yet I did rather ſubſcribe to them, and wrote not all of any one of them with mine own hand; but you may take it as a token of my heartie love, that I wrote all this Epiſtle my ſelf: You ſee how large a letter I have writ to you with mine own hand.* And this ſenſe better anſwereth to the coherence, then that of S. Hierom, or of the other learned man whom S. Hierom wondered at. So much for the third *Lemma*.

8. I come now to the firſt Queſtion: *viz.* Whether it was neceſſarie that Scripture ſhould be written for mens inſtruction?

That it was not abſolutely neceſſarie, muſt be confeſt: for God might have uſed other means. He is *liberrimum agens*, *the freeſt agent*; or rather *ipſa libertas*, *libertie it ſelf*, not chained to fate, nor bound in with nature or ſecond cauſes. Neceſsitie, freedome of our will, or indifferencie to either ſide, and contingencie, are the iſſues of his will.

Yea, God did uſe other means in the law of nature; for above 2450 yeares the Patriarchs were nouriſhed with agraphall Tradition onely. No word was ever written till God wrote the Law; the two firſt Tables, the work of the onely-wiſe Almightie; *The writing was the writing of God graven upon the Tables*, Exod.32.16. *Written with the finger of God*, Exod.31.18.

The Jews ſay, The book of Geneſis was written by Moſes, before God wrote the Law. For though God ſpake all the

the words of the Decalogue, Exod.20.1. &c. yet he delivered not the Tables to Moſes till Exod.31.18. but Exod. 24.4. it is related, that *Moſes wrote all the words of the Lord:* and verſ. 7. that *he took the book of the Law, and read it in the audience of the people.* Kemnitius anſwereth, That the things are recorded *per Anticipationem, ſeu per* ὑστερον πρότερον, *The laſt is recorded in the firſt place:* for the writing and dedication here mentioned, were accompliſhed afterward, Exod.34.32.

The pillar of ſtone, and that other of brick, which Joſephus *Antiq.*1.4. ſaith the children of Seth did write in before the floud, were either fictions, or antidated. The propheſie of Enoch was not written by him, as S. Auguſtine *de Civit.* 15.22. and Origen *Hom.*28. *in Num.* think: but *Enoch propheſied, Saying,* Jude 14. As the propheſie of Adam, Geneſ. 2. 24. and of God himſelf, Geneſ. 3. 15. both of them concerning Chriſt, were ſpoken in Paradiſe, not written; and as the Apoſtles wrote not the Creed, but delivered it onely *vivâ voce, by word of mouth,* ſaith Irenæus, 3.4. and Auguſtine *de Fide & Oper. cap.9.* and Ruffinus on the Creed, and divers others: ſo is it likely, that Enochs propheſie was not written; or rather was written long after it was ſpoken: for writing was not ſo neceſſarie for the Patriarchs: Firſt, *becauſe they were purer in minde,* ſaith Chryſoſtom, *Hom.* 1. *in Matth.* And it is the fault of our corrupt nature, and we may be rightly impleaded, that ever there was any writing; as may be gathered from Iſidorus Peleuſiota, *lib.* 3. *epiſt.* 106. Secondly, the long lives of the Patriarchs ſupplied the room of writing: for Methuſalah, who lived 240 yeares with Adam (with the firſt Adam, *who was* ÆTATIS ILLIUS EPISCOPUS, *Biſhop of thoſe times,* ſaith Kemnitius *in Examine, part.*1. *pag.*13.) lived alſo 90 and odde yeares with Sem, and Sem lived 50 yeares in Jacobs time, by the calculation of Helvicus; and there were not 200 yeares from Jacobs death to the writing of the Law. Thirdly, beſides ſuch aged venerable Prophets as were Adam, Enoch, Noah, and Abraham (who was an eminent inſtructer with authoritie, and, as it were, with a Pretorian power: Gen.18.19. *I know that Abraham will command his ſonnes and his houſhold after him, that they keep the way of the Lord*) other Patriarchs knew the will of God by immediate revelation, by dreams and viſions; πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως, *At ſundrie times, and in divers manners,* Heb. 1. 1. Gods ſpeech was in ſtead of writing. But when men grew more impure, and upon the increaſe of ſinne mans dayes were ſhortened, God did withdraw himſelf, and his familiar converſation was not ſo common: but becauſe their hearts of fleſh were hardened, in which was printed the law of nature, by them even obliterated, and they received new evil impreſſions in ſtonie hearts; God himſelf wrote

wrote the Morall Law in two Tables of ſtone: and Gods own handie-work being broken by the occaſion of their ſinne, to ſhew that the Morall Law ſhould continue for ever, the broken Tables were removed (and none knoweth what ever became of them) and Moſes was commanded to frame two new whole Tables of ſtone, like the former.

Two extreams about the written word are here to be avoided: The firſt is of the Papiſts, who too much diſgrace the Scripture, at leaſt comparatively; [x] *Do you think that more ſects and hereſies would have bubbled up, if there had been no Scripture at all, then now are, when God hath ſent us the holy Writ? I rather incline to that ſide, who think there would have been fewer diviſions*, ſaith Gretſer in his defence of Bellarm. *de Verb. Dei*, 4.4. Pighius *de Eccleſ. Hierarch.* 1.2. ſaith [y] *That the Apoſtles wrote ſome things, not that they might rule over our Faith and Religion, but be ſubject rather:* and concludeth, that the Church is not onely not inferiour, nor onely equall, but in a ſort ſuperiour to the Scriptures. The Carmelite Antonius Marinarus, in the ſecond book of the Hiſtorie of the Councel of Trent, pag. 118. is confident, [z] *That the Church was moſt perfect before any Apoſtle wrote, and that the Church of Chriſt had never wanted perfection, though never any thing had been written.* Majoranus *Clyp.* 2.28. thus, [a] *The uniform conſent of the Church, which never was deſtitute of Gods Spirit, ought more to be eſteemed by us, then all the dumbe writings and volumes which are or ſhall be written: which have miniſtred matter of debate to the wits of men.* Theſe are accurſed errours, and eaſily confuted; becauſe traditions are inconſtant, and their number was never yet determined by themſelves; but the Scripture is certain, and our Saviour both rebuketh the Phariſees for holding of traditions, Mark. 7.8, &c. Luk. 11.39. Matth. 23.18. and commandeth them to ſearch the Scriptures, John 5.39. and refereth himſelf, and the whole courſe of his life and death to be examined by Scripture, Luke 24. 25, &c.

The other extream is of ſuch, who neglect or deride the Church and the very name thereof, becauſe they have the written word: and theſe do as much glory in it, as the Jews did in the materiall Temple of Solomon; when, in truth, their contempt of the Church and its power, turns to their damnation, without repentance; and if the frequent, divine, immediate revelation had been imparted by God to us, as it was to the Patriarchs, it had been better for us: for in that illumination there was no errour, no miſtaking, no doubtfulneſſe, but an impoſsibilitie of being deceived. So that my diſcourſe endeth in the point in which it began, The Scripture was not abſolutely neceſſarie to be written; but *ex hypotheſi, conditionally*, and ſuppoſing the divine decree, it was neceſſarie; yea upon

[x] *Putáſne plures hæreſes & ſectas exorituras fuiſſe, ſi nulla penitus Scriptura extitiſſet, quàm nunc cùm Scriptura mortalibus à cælo data eſt? Ego certè propior ſum exiſtimanti, pauciores fuiſſe futuras.*

[y] *Apoſtolos quædam ſcripſiſſe, non ut ſcripta illa præeſſent Fidei & Religioni noſtræ; ſed ut ſubeſſent potiùs.*

[z] *Eccleſiam fuiſſe perfectiſſimam, priuſquam Sanctorum Apoſtolorũ ullus ſcripſiſſet: neq. Eccleſiam Chriſti perfectione ullâ carituram, etiamſi nihil unquam ſcripto fuiſſet mandatum.*

[a] *Unus Eccleſiæ conſenſus, qui nunquam carnit Spiritu Dei, pluris apud nos eſſe debet, quàm omnes elingues & muti codices, & quotquot ſunt & erunt unquam ſcripta volumina, quæ hominum ingeniis ſemper materiam contentionis præbuerunt.*

upon corruption of manners and doctrine, it was not onely πρέπειν, *convenient*, but Νον, *neceſſarie*: not onely the moſt convenient way, but the moſt neceſſarie means. Otherwiſe, God would never have written it. It is neceſſarie, if not as a cauſe, yet as a concauſe; *The word as a cauſe, the writing as a concauſe*, ſaith Trelcatius. The Scriptures are not ſimply neceſſarie *ad eſſe Eccleſiæ, to the being of a Church*, whatſoever Scharpius ſaith; but *ad bene eſſe, to the wel-being*: for nothing was written of the New Teſtament in Chriſts life-time, nor in ſome yeares after. Away with the Popiſh vilifying of Scripture; [c] *Matter of ſtrife* (ſay they) *and not the voice of the judge*. Away with the Puritanicall cut, diſdaining the Church, and the interpreters thereof (to wit, their thrice-reverend Biſhops and Prieſts) and priding themſelves in their own ſenſeleſſe private Spirit.

[c] *Materia litis, non vox judicis.*

The ſecond queſtion followeth; *viz.* Whether the holy Penmen or Actuaries wrote the Scripture caſually?

I anſwer, If we take *caſually* for *fortè fortunâ*, for *ſole chance*, or *onely bare contingencie*, they wrote not caſually:

Te facimus, Fortuna, deam, cæloque locamus:

Men think they make Fortune a goddeſſe (a giddie one like the people themſelves) but indeed God worketh that which we call Fortune amongſt men. Auguſtine *lib.* 80. *quæſt. quæſt.* 24. divinely reaſoneth in this ſort, What is done by chance, is done ſuddenly, or raſhly: what is ſo done, is not done providently; but whileſt providence adminiſtreth all things, nothing falls by chance in this world; if through it we look up to God, as to the univerſall cauſe by his providence: *For nothing falls under our ſenſes, but was commanded or permitted from the inviſible and intelligible Hall of the higheſt Emperour*, ſaith Auguſtine, *de Trin.* 3.4.

1. Kings 22. 34. *A certain man drew a bow at a venture* (or, *in his ſimplicitie*) *and ſmote the King of Iſrael between the joynts of the harneſſe.* What the 32 Captains of the King of Aram could not accompliſh, though this were their Commiſsion, *Fight neither with ſmall nor great, ſave onely with the King of Iſrael*, verſ. 13. that this roving arrow did by chance accompliſh, and ſlew the bloudie Ahab: yet ſo by chance, as the hand of the Lord did guide it, —*Nec erranti Deus abfuit*: — and it might have been written on the ſhaft, before it was drawn out of the quiver, *Deus Achabo*; more certainly then what was written on the arrow that ſtroke out the eye of Philip of Macedon, *Aſtur Philippo.*

A wealthy merchant ſendeth two of his Factours, one to the Eaſt Indies, the other to the Weſt; each of them not knowing the others employments: after certain yeares he appointeth each of them to be at ſuch a port on ſuch a moneth and day,

day, if they ſo can: They both meet, both wonder, both at the firſt hold it a ſtrange chance; when the deep wiſdome of their maſter providently determined all this. There is no *chance* where *providence* reigneth.

If we take *caſually* as importing counſel meerly humane led by opportunitie onely, and excluding inſpiration; as men *conſilium capiunt ex tempore, & pro re nata, Adviſe according to the freſh occurrences:* or, as *bonæ leges ex malis moribus oriuntur, Good laws are made upon former miſ-behaviour:* thus the holy Prophets, Evangeliſts, and Apoſtles wrote not caſually; for as *the Propheſie came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God ſpake as they were moved by the Holy Ghoſt*, 2. Pet. 1.21. ſo both for the Old and New Teſtament, S. Paul ſaith, *All Scripture is given by inſpiration of God*, 2. Tim. 3. 16. Is that caſuall?

If we conceive the matter thus, *The holy penmen wrote caſually*, that is, *Upon juſt occaſions, and newly emergent occurrences, the Spirit of God inſpired them to write, who otherwiſe would not have written*; I will ſay they wrote *caſually*; for *caſualtie* in this notion preſuppoſeth things done upon reaſon; and *who dareth ſay that God did ever any thing without good ground or reaſon*, ſaith the divine S. Auguſtine? They wrote *fortuitò*, ſay the Papiſts; *non fortuitò*, ſaith Vorſtius: Cleare the terms by the former diſtinction, and the queſtion is ended.

No part of Jeremie is in Chaldee, but one verſe onely; and upon what occaſion was that? *The Chaldee Paraphraſt thus relateth it*, ſaith Vatablus; *Jeremie wrote to the Elders in the Captivitie; If the Chaldean people did ſay, Houſe of Iſrael, worſhip idols; the Iſraelites ſhould anſwer, The idols which ye worſhip are idols indeed, in which is no profit: they cannot draw forth rain from heaven, or fruit out of the earth; Let them and their worſhippers periſh from the earth, and be deſtroyed from under heaven.* And to that effect ſpeak Lyra and Rabbi Solomon: but the words of God by the Prophet are thus to be rendered, Jer. 10.11. *Thus ye ſhall ſay unto them, May the gods*, or, *Let the gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, periſh from the earth, and from under theſe heavens*; PEREANT, ſo the Vulgat, Vatablus, the Interlinearie, and tranſlated Chaldee: Ἀπολέσθωσαν, ſay the Septuagint. And this doth ſomewhat ammuſe me, why our laſt Engliſh Tranſlation, with others, embrace the Future tenſe, reading *They ſhall periſh*, when the words are a preſent execration of paſt, preſent, and future idols. I come to the point; If the Jews had ſaid the effect of theſe words in Hebrew, the Chaldeans could not have underſtood it; nor had it been written in Chaldee, if the Chaldeans had had no intercourſe with the Jews; and in this ſenſe that verſe was written *caſually*.

As

As Ananias and Sapphira their with-holding of things consecrated, miniſtred occaſion to the holy Spirit, both to impart the knowledge of their ſacriledge to S. Peter, and to inſpire into him that particular propheſie, Act. 5. 9. which S. Peter otherwiſe had never ſpoken: So if Oneſimus had not been a bad ſervant, and after converted, S. Paul had not written that Epiſtle to Philemon, at leaſt not the greateſt part of it. Chemnitius, *in Examine, part.* 1. declareth at large, *Quâ occaſione, propter quam cauſam, & in quem uſum, primùm Scriptura tradita ſit à Deo:* And he ſpeaketh of the Old Teſtament.

Concerning the New Teſtament, neither Chriſt nor any of his Apoſtles wrote any thing for many yeares; nor did any one Evangeliſt or Apoſtle ſingly write, till the Church was peſtered with Schiſmaticks, *Who troubled them with words, ſubverting their ſouls*, Act. 15. 24. To remedie which diſcord, a Councel was gathered at Jeruſalem of the Apoſtles and Elders with the whole Church; and they wrote Letters, or an Epiſtle to the brethren; And, [a] *Viſum eſt Spiritui Sancto & nobis, It ſeemed good to the holy Ghoſt and to us*, was the forefront of their main decree. And *this was the beginning of writing of any part of the New Teſtament*, ſaith Chemnitius in his *Examen* of the Councel of Trent, *part.* 1. *pag.* 32. though others diſſent from him. I will onely ſay, If that ſchiſme had not been, that Councel had not been gathered, that Epiſtle had not been written. Briefly thus: Euſebius in the ſecond and third book of his hiſtorie, ſpecializeth the cauſes and grounds why each of the foure Evangeliſts did write; which is exemplified by Chemnitius in the place before cited, even to ſatietie; whileſt he at large deſcribeth the occaſions, and inducements, or reaſons, why all and every book of the New Teſtament was written. Thus the concluſion being firm, That *the word of God was written caſually*, that is, *the ſacred Pen-men were inſpired to write all of it upon juſt motives, and fair occurrences*; and yet *not caſually*, if we take the word, *in ſenſu profano, & uſu forenſi:* I proceed to the third Queſtion,

[a] Acts 15. 28.

Whether they were commanded to write?

They who reade the Scripture, may think this queſtion idle and impertinent: but who hath been converſant in the thornie paths of controverſies, ſhall finde much oppoſition by our adverſaries. Bellarmine, *de Verbo Dei non ſcripto*, 4. 3. ſaith thus, [b] *It is falſe that God commanded the Apoſtles to write. We have read they were commanded to preach, Matth.* 28. 19. *we have not read that they were commanded to write. God did not command expreſſely either that they ſhould write, or not write.* To the place alledged by Bellarmine, I anſwer: They are not there commanded *Prædicare*, but his verie Vulgat hath it *Docere*; which may be by writing, as well as by preaching.

[b] *Falſum eſt, Datum mandâſſe Apoſtolis ut ſcriberent. Legimus mandatum ut prædicarent; ut ſcriberent nunquam legimus. Deus nec mandavit expreſsè ut ſcriberent, nec ut non ſcriberent.*

The Original hath it μαθητέυσατε, *diſcipulate*, or *diſcipulas facite omnes gentes*: where μαθητέυειν is not taken *neutro-paſſively*, for *diſcipulum eſſe*; for that implieth that the Apoſtles ſhould learn of the Gentiles, and not teach them: but *actively*, as if it were in the Conjugation HIPHIL; *ac ſi dicas*, DISCIPULARE, ſaith Beza. The very word κηρύξατε, *prædicate*, *preach*, uſed Mark 16.15. doth not neceſſarily imply onely the Apoſtolicall preaching *vivâ voce in ſuggeſto, aloud in a pulpit*; but doth ſignifie a publication in generall: not onely a going up into the pulpit (as idiots imagine:) for an Angel did κηρύσσειν, Revel.5.2. *preach*; or *proclaim*, as it is in our laſt Tranſlation: and *Chriſt preached to the ſpirits in priſon*, 1.Pet.3.19. and the poſſeſſed of a legion of devils, being diſpoſſeſſed, ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν, Mark 5.20. *Began to preach, or publiſh, how great things Jeſus had done for him.* None of theſe (I dare ſay) climbed up into the pulpit. Moreover, publication may be by writing, aſwell as by preaching; and more diſciples have been made by Evangelicall and Apoſtolicall writings, then ever were by their preachings in their own times.

I anſwer again: He ſaith, *It is falſe.* To prove a falſhood a man muſt have expreſſe truth, which he confeſſeth he hath not: and how lamely followeth this? *Becauſe we now reade it not, Ergò, they were not commanded.* He would have laught at ſuch a negative proof of ours. Auguſtine ſaith, [c] *Whatſoever Chriſt would have us reade of his words and works, that did he command the Evangeliſts, as if they had been his own hands, to write.* Bellarmine anſwereth: [d] *He ſpeaketh of the inward command, which is rather a ſuggeſtion and inſpiration then a proper command.* I reply; Of precepts properly ſo called, ſome are hid and ſecret, others more manifeſt: the internall command bindes as much as the externall; divine ſuggeſtions oft times have the force of an expreſſe inward precept; and commands are ſometimes manifeſted by inſpirations. *Præceptum propriè dictum*, which is by word or writing, and *Imperium internum*, may be equivalent; and ſo long as it is *Imperium internum*, what need we care though it be not *Præceptum propriè dictum?* And the command was to write, which is an outward act.

The ſecond Objection brought by Bellarmine againſt himſelf, is from the Revelation, where S. John is commanded divers times *to write.* To this he anſwereth moſt unclerk-like, That *S. John was commanded to write certain hidden viſions; not the doctrine of the Goſpel, and precepts of manners.* But this is eaſily confuted: for Revel.19.9. it is ſaid, *Write, Bleſſed are they which are called to the marriage-ſupper of the Lambe.* Is not this the doctrine of the Goſpel? what is more Evangelicall? He might have conſidered the marriage-feaſts in the Goſpels,

[c] *Quicquid Chriſtus de ſuis factis & dictis nos legere voluit, hoc ſcribendum Evangeliſtis, tanquam ſuis manibus imperavit.*

[d] *Loquitur de imperio interno, quod ſuggeſtio quædam & inſpiratio potiùs quàm præceptum propriè dictum exiſtimari debet.*

Goſpels, Matth. 22.2, &c. and Luk. 14.16. And a voice from heaven ſaid, Revel. 14.13. *Write, Bleſſed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth; yea, ſaith the Spirit, that they may reſt from their labours, and their works do follow them.* Are theſe hidden viſions? Is not this the doctrine of the Goſpel? The like might be amplified out of the firſt, ſecond, and third chapters of the Revelation, where matters of moralitie and precepts of manners are commanded to be written, and are written: and not hidden viſions, but rather the doctrine of repentance, and of the Goſpel.

Chriſt ſaith to his Apoſtles, Act. 1.8. *Ye ſhall be witneſſes unto me.* He forbeareth the word of *preaching*; and uſeth more generall words, ἔσεσθέ μοι μάρτυρες, *Ye ſhall be witneſſes*; and they bare witneſſe by writing: Joh. 21.24. *This is the diſciple which teſtifieth of theſe things, and wrote theſe things; and we know that his teſtimonie is true*; not onely he himſelf, but Peter and the reſt, WE *know that his teſtimonie is true:* what teſtimonie but his writings? [d] *He would have all his works or writings beleeved,* ſaith Luc. Brugenſis, and Maldonate.

[d] *Toti operi ſuo fidem vult conciliare.*

When the ſeven thunders had uttered their voices, I was about to write, ſaith S. John, *and a voice from heaven ſaith, Write them not,* Revel. 10.4. The Apoſtles forwardneſſe or proneneſſe to write, argueth not neceſſarily that he was not commanded firſt to write; but rather preſuppoſeth it: and this preſent inhibition, *Write not,* may ſerve as an exception to a former generall command that he might have to write.

Indeed there is no expreſſe record that all and every of the Apoſtles were enjoyned to write: nor is it likely they were; for then they would have obeyed; whereas not the one half of the Apoſtles committed any thing to pen, ink, and paper, for ought we know; But we are ſure that ſome writers of the Old Teſtament were commanded to write: Exod. 17.14. *And the Lord ſaid unto Moſes, Write this for a memoriall in a book*; Jerem. 36.2. *Take thee a roll of a book, and write therein all the words that I have ſpoken unto thee, &c.* and S. John was commanded eleven or twelve times to write: and thence it is more then probable, that the reſt of the Apoſtles which wrote were commanded to write; they might be expreſſely appointed to write, though in their writings ſo much be not expreſſed. To ſay as Bellarmine doth, *It is falſe that God commanded the Apoſtles to write, becauſe ſo much is not written*, is raſh and ill-adviſed; inferring, that they were commanded nothing, except thoſe things which are written. Is every thing falſe that cannot be proved? is nothing true but what can be proved? To evince a thing to be falſe, is required a reall proof of truth poſitive, which Bellarmine wanteth: and the falſitie may juſtly be retorted home to the Cardinall himſelf, from

the authoritie of a prime man of his own part. Wiſer Aquinas 3. *part. quæſt.* 42. *artic.* 4. *&* 2. thus, *When the diſciples of Chriſt had written what he ſhewed and ſpake unto them, we muſt in no wiſe ſay that Chriſt himſelf did not write, ſince his members wrote that which they knew by the dictate of him their Head. For whatſoever he would have us reade of his deeds and words, he commanded them as his own hands to write.* Now let Bellarmine ſay, *It is falſe, that the Apoſtles were commanded by God to write.* And thus much ſhall ſerve for the third queſtion.

The fourth queſtion. Whether the Prophets, Evangeliſts, and Apoſtles were compelled to write?

As when it is ſaid, Luke 1. 70. God Spake By The Mouth Of His Holy Prophets, *per* Loquendi *verbum*, Scriptionem *quoque comprehendit:* ſo what I propound of Propheticall, Evangelicall, and Apoſtolicall *writing*, muſt alſo be underſtood of their *ſpeaking*, or *dictating*; Whether they were compelled to it?

Compulſion is of two ſorts; *Proper* and *abſolute*, *Improper* or *mixt.*

Proper, when a man is forced (as we ſay) in ſpight of his teeth, againſt his will; as ſome who have been drawn to puniſhment. Thus were they not compelled.

Mixt, when a man doth that which he would not do, unleſſe he feared a greater loſſe; as when a Merchant or Mariner caſt their goods into the ſea to ſave their lives; which hath in it part of the voluntarie, and part of the involuntarie: And of this there may be ſome queſtion; for *Jonah fled from the preſence of the Lord*, Jon. 1. 3. that is, was unwilling to do the meſſage. Moſes again and again refuſed to be Gods embaſſadour to Pharaoh, Exod. 3. 11. and to the Iſraelites, Exod. 4. 1, 10, 13. Iſaiah was alſo backward, Iſa. 6. 5. One anſwer ſerves for all: They were at firſt *fearfull* rather then *unwilling*; but when they were confirmed, they readily and boldly did their duties. So farre were they from ſhadow of compulſion, that they offered their ſervice. When the voice of the Lord ſaid, *Whom ſhall I ſend?* and, *Who will go for Us?* (Iſa. 6. 8.) the Prophet ſaid, *Here am I, ſend me.*

Yea, but they were *impulſi, rapti, agitati, acti,* φερόμενοι, 2. Pet. 1. 21. I anſwer, The word rather excludeth voluntarie and arbitrarie will-worſhip, or ſelf-will-ſervice; then includeth compulſion: for all this was performed *Libero motu voluntatis, With the free motion of their will:* or (as others take it) *Salvo pleno uſu liberi arbitrii, Without any impeachment of the freedome of their will.* •*They who were led by the holy Ghoſt, ſpake, being inſpired by God: yet know that their motions and inſpirations were ſetled and compoſed; unlike to the profane heathen prieſts or prophets*

• *Acti à Spiritu ſancto loquuti ſunt à Deo afflati; compoſitos tamen intellige hos motus; non quales fuere profanorum vatum.*

phets (for they were wilde, ſenſleſſe, not knowing what they did or ſaid) ſaith Tremellius. Rom. 8. 14. *Many are led by the Spirit of God,* Ἄγονται. *Aguntur* is no more in effect then *ducuntur.* If it had been *trahuntur*, yet [f] *Meat draweth a ſheep to it*, ſaith Auguſtine: and all is farre from coaction. And this may ſtop the mouth of Aretius, ſaying, on Peter 2. 1. [g] *Moſes, Elias, and others, who had rather have fled from theſe duties, were oft unwillingly drawn to them.*

[f] *Herba trahit ovem.*

[g] *Inviti ſæpe rapti ſunt in hunc ordinem, Moſes, Elias, & alii, qui fugâ potiùs hoc munus maluiſſent declinare.*

It may be further objected: Act. 4. 20. *We cannot but ſpeak the things which we have ſeen and heard.* Fond is the expoſition of the Ordinary gloſſe, *We* CANNOT, *that is, We* WILL NOT. By ſuch a *That is* I will confound heaven with earth. But I anſwer, The words imply no violence; the wills of the Apoſtles were not inforced: if the will of man could be compelled, it were no longer *Voluntas, A will*, but rather *Noluntas, No will.* A thing may be ſaid *Poſſe, aut non poſſe fieri, To be, or not to be made*, theſe wayes:

1. *We cannot but ſpeak*, that is, *Non poſſumus convenienter tacere, It is unreaſonable that we ſhould be ſilent. Can the children of the Bridechamber mourn?* (Matth. 9. 15.) is a queſtion without queſtion; for certainly they could: but while the bridegroom was with them, *they could not mourn*; that is, *It was no fit time for them to mourn.* Likewiſe, the Apoſtles could hold their peace; but then it became them not: and therefore they ſay, *We cannot but ſpeak.*

2. *Non poſſumus licitè, We cannot lawfully:* ſo Lyra expounds the words. *We can do nothing againſt the truth*, ſaith S. Paul, 2. Cor. 13. 8. that is, *We cannot lawfully:* unlawfully he might, and ſo might any other. So here, *If we do lawfully, and as we ought, We cannot but ſpeak.*

3. *We cannot but ſpeak*, that is, *We are very prone and apt to ſpeak.* Mat. 12. 34. *How can ye, being evil, ſpeak good things?* and how could the Apoſtles, being good, but ſpeak good things? their ſouls were filled with grace, which boiled forth into words; their mouth could not chooſe but ſpeak what their heart thought: *My heart was hot within me, while I was muſing the fire burned; then ſpake I with my tongue*, Pſal. 39. 3.

4. *We cannot but ſpeak*; that is, *We ſpeak not of our ſelves, but as God teacheth us:*

Eſt Deus in nobis, agitante caleſcimus illo:
When God on us doth blow, By him our heat doth grow.

He moveth us, *& mota facilius commoventur, Things fixt are not ſo ſoon moved as things in motion:* ſo the Apoſtles were ſilent before; but when the Spirit enlightned their underſtanding and framed their words, could they hold their tongues? themſelves anſwer, *We cannot but ſpeak.*

I ſumme it up all thus: It was inconvenient not to ſpeak;

It was ſinfull not to ſpeak; It proceeded from the habits of grace and goodneſſe that they were ſo prone to ſpeak; It proceeded from the celeſtiall ſuggeſtion, actuating their hearts and tongues: Therefore (ſay they) *VVe cannot but ſpeak:* And yet away with all coaction.

Others may yet alledge the 1. Cor. 9. 16. *Neceßitie is laid upon me to preach the Goſpel*; and verſe 17. *If I do this thing willingly, I have a reward: but if againſt my will, a diſpenſation is committed unto me.* Unto the firſt part I anſwer, The neceſſitie is not of preſſure, angariation, or force; but of precept: *Obſtrictus ſum ad hoc, I am commanded and bound to this,* as it is in the tranſlated Arabick: for he was often commanded to preach: In Damaſcus, Act. 22.15. in the temple of Jeruſalem, Act.22.21. at Antioch, Act. 13.2. [h] *If unto the precept I adde a willing-readie heart, I have my reward,* ſaith Aquin. But, *I will freely ſacrifice unto the Lord,* ſaith David, Pſal. 54. 6. and S. Paul will preach rather for *love,* then *neceßitie.*

The other part of the words, *againſt my will,* evinceth not compulſion, but backwardneſſe, ſlowneſſe, and ill ends. If I preach WILLINGLY; that is, *for the love of Chriſt, of my ſelf, of my brethrens ſouls, for Gods honour and glorie, and at his command,* I HAVE MY REWARD: But if AGAINST MY WILL, that is, *Unwillingly, or in an unwilling manner:* ([i] *If for onely ſervile fear I preach,* ſaith Aquinas) *if for fear of wo denounced againſt me, if for my private ends of fame or gain; yet even to ſuch a mercenary* IS THE DISPENSATION COMMITTED. Ἄκων is oppoſed to Ἑκών, the words *againſt my will,* are not ſo properly expounded, though it runne ſo in our Tranſlation. Ἑκὼν is *with a good will,* as Coverdale well tranſlates it: ἑκὼν ſignifieth a thing done *proprio motu*; therefore ἄκων is *with an ill will, grudgingly, mercenarily:* Ἄκων is *non volens, ſluggiſhly, drawlingly, formally, for faſhions ſake.* I will conclude this anſwer with the expoſition of the Arabick and Syriack Tranſlatours: [k] *If I do this purpoſely, with a full will, I have my reward: if when I do it, it is harſh, unpleaſant, and ſowre, &c.* ſaith Arabs. [l] *If with my will, if beſides my will,* ſaith Syrus. None of this taſteth of coaction.

There yet ariſeth up another objection: The ſame Apoſtle ſaith, *The love of Chriſt conſtraineth us,* 2. Cor. 5. 14. I anſwer, The words are diverſly expounded: *Urget nos, Urgeth us,* ſaith the Vulgat; *Cohibet nos, Reſtraineth us,* ſaith Montanus; *Continet nos, Containeth us,* ſaith Oecumenius; *Incendit nos amore, Setteth us on fire with love,* ſaith Theodoret; *Charitas Chriſti conſtringit nos in hac ſententia, The love of Chriſt bindes us faſt in this opinion,* ſaith Arabs: ſuch a conſtraint as would not be free; ſuch a bond or knot as would not be untied; ſuch a conſtraint as when a man is commanded to do that which he would do with-

[h] *Si voluntatem adjungo neceſſitati præcepti, mercedem habeo.*

[i] *Si ſolo timore ſervili prædico.*

[k] *Si facio hoc ex propoſito mentis meæ, voluntate meâ, eſt mihi merces; ſi autem, cùm facio, ingratum eſt mihi, &c.*

[l] *Si voluntate meâ, ſi præter voluntatem meam.*

without command; when precept is joyned to voluntarineſſe; when injunction is interpoſed between both precedent and ſubſequent willingneſſe. So much for the Objections.

On the other ſide, for the truth theſe arguments ſtand forth.

Luke 1.3. *It ſeemed good unto me to write unto thee,* ſaith he. This proveth that the Evangeliſt was not compelled.

Gal.6.11. *Ye ſee how large a letter I have written unto you with mine own hand*; by which words S. Paul ſeeketh to ingratiate himſelf with them for that labour. But it was neither matter of kindeneſſe on his part, nor thank-worthy on their part, if he were compelled.

No man dares write in a Princes name, without his command: S. John was ſpoke to, adviſed, commanded twelve times to write: that he was compelled I reade not.

The ſecond of Johns Epiſtle verſ.12. the Apoſtle had *many things to write*; yet *would not write with paper and ink*, or *with ink and pen*, as he phraſeth it, Epiſt.3.verſ.13. If he *would not*, how was he conſtrained?

S. Jude *gave all diligence to write*, verſ.3. ſo farre was he from coaction; And *it was needfull for me to write*, ſaith he in the ſame place: It was not abſolutely neceſſarie; he ſaith not that he was compelled.

Divers followers of Solomon wrote his Proverbs; who coacted them?

S. Paul *wrote according to the wiſdome given unto him*, 2. Pet.3.15. Was this a power compulſive?

In the Epiſtle to Philemon, verſ. 21. *Having confidence in thy obedience, I wrote unto thee, knowing that thou wilt alſo do more then I ſay:* which words imply, he would not have writ if he had thought Philemon would have been obſtinate, or refractarie, and would have done nothing at his requeſt: howſoever, he was free from coaction.

2.Tim.1.5. The remembrance of the unfeigned faith in Timothie, in Lois, and Eunice, was the reaſon of S.Pauls writing unto him. Doth reaſon uſe violence?

By Silvanus I wrote briefly, exhorting you, ſaith the Apoſtle, 1.Pet.5.12. Was he compelled himſelf, who exhorted others?

[m] *It implieth a contradiction to ſay ſimply, The will was inforced to the act of willing,* ſaith Scotus. The will may be compelled by God or by the creature, *quantum ad actus imperatos, ſo farre as belongeth to the commanded acts in which the body is paſsive.* Joh. 21. 18. *Another ſhall gird thee, and carrie thee whither thou wouldeſt not*, ſaith Chriſt to Peter. Many are compelled to go to the Gaol, and to be hanged: but the will is induced, *quantum ad actus elicitos, by the emanant and diſtilled acts.* What the holy Penmen ſpake or wrote, they did freely and willingly, void of compulſion.

[m] *Simpliciter voluntatem cogi ad actum volendi, contradictio eſt.*

The fifth queſtion followeth, *viz.* Whether the holy Penmen underſtood all that they wrote?

Chriſtopher Caſtrus on the ſmaller Prophets, *lib. 3. de vera futurorum cognitione, cap. 12.* handleth this point at large; and to him I ow a great part of theſe authorities. Montanus held that *the Patriarchs and Prophets ſpake in an ecſtaſie, not knowing what they ſaid*; as Epiphanius, *Hæreſ. 48. contra Montaniſtas*, relateth. But he was an heretick for it. The devil ſo moveth the tongues of the rapted or ecſtaticall heathen, that they neither underſtand what they ſpeak, nor have power not to ſpeak; and their *ſpeech is low out of the duſt, and their voice out of the ground*, Iſa. 29. 4. as with the Montaniſts their Prophetiſſes Priſca and Maximilla; and among the heathen the Pythoniſts; and divers orders of religious irreligion this day among the Turks, eſpecially the Derviſes. But *our Prophets*, ſaith the worthy Eſtius, *did ſpeak and write, prophetticall light being infuſed into them, and the knowledge of the myſteries inſpired, and with the free motion of their will.* The Fathers run in full ſtreams to this depth.

Origen, *Homil. 6. in cap. 16. Ezekielis*, [n] *The Prophets were in their right mindes.* And *Tom. 6. in Joan.* [o] *We muſt confeſſe that the Prophets underſtood what they ſpake, and carried in their lips the courteous grace of their minde.* And (*Periarch. 3. 3.*) [p] *All the Prophets and Apoſtles were obedient to the words divine, without any diſturbance or diſtraction of minde.*

Baſil *in Proœmio Iſaiæ*, [q] *Some ſay that the divinely illuminated do propheſie, their humane ſoul being ſwallowed up of the Spirit. But it abhorreth from the profeſſed truth, and goodneſſe of the divine preſence, to make him a mad man who is inſpired by God: and when he ſhall begin to be filled with divine Oracles, that then he ſhould be out of his own wits. Is it likely or convenient that one by the Spirit of wiſdome ſhould be made moſt like to a mad man? Rather light ſtirreth up the viſive facultie naturally: nor doth light breed blindeneſſe, nor the Spirit infuſe darkneſſe into the mindes of men.* See the ſame Baſil on Iſaiah 13, at the beginning: Chryſoſtom, *Homil. 29. in primam Epiſt. ad Corinth.* 12. Hierom *in proœm. Iſaiæ, & Nahum, & Abacuc, & in 3. cap. ad Epheſ.* Auguſtine *de Geneſ. ad literam* 12. 9. and *Epiſt.* 112. and *contra Adamantium Manichæum, cap.* 28. Gregorie, *Moral.* 11. 12. All aim at this mark.

That they were *rapti*, or *in an ecſtaſie*, none denieth: but there is a double ecſtaſie. The firſt either from outward and inward ſenſes, the minde remaining more enlightened and free and perfect: Thus were they ſometimes in an ecſtaſie. Secondly, there is an ecſtaſie from the minde it ſelf; when it underſtandeth not: Thus they were never in an ecſtaſie. So Philo Judæus in his book, *Quis rerum divinarum hæres?*

[n] *Non excidebant mente Prophetæ.*

[o] *Fatendum eſt, quæ proprio ore protulerunt Prophetæ, eos intellexiſſe, inque labiis geſtâſſe animi candorem.*

[p] *Omnes Prophetæ vel Apoſtoli divinis reſponſis ſine ulla mentis obturbatione miniſtrabant*

[q] *Sunt qui dicunt eos extra ſe raptos, prophetare, humanâ mente à Spiritu abſorptâ. Verùm id abhorret à profeſſione divinæ præſentiæ, ut amentem reddat qui à numine corripitur: cúmq; plenus divinorum decretorum eſſe cœperit, tum à propria mente excidat. Quomodo conſentaneum eſt, ut quis ex ſapientiæ Spiritu reddatur ſimillimus inſano? Quin potiùs neque lumen cæcitatem parit, verùm videndi vim à natura inſitam expergefacit: nec Spiritus tenebras inducit animis.*

Cyril

Cyril, *lib.* 8. *in Joannem, cap.* 3. [r] *It is not alwayes neceſſarie that a Prophet ſhould underſtand whatſoever he foretelleth. Daniel had many viſions which at the firſt he underſtood not, but was after taught by an Angel; and yet he forfeited not the name of a Prophet.*

I anſwer with Hierom on Daniel 10. *They did know what the things ſignified, though they were not preſently inlightened;* [s] *that upon the delay occaſion might be miniſtred unto them to pray oftner and more unto God, and with tears and faſting call upon him, that God would ſend his Angel to inſtruct Daniel.* So that every Prophet knew what words he ſpake, and knew the literall meaning of every word: but the ſpirituall meaning they underſtood not at the firſt, or preſently, but afterwards. So Zacharie ſaw many things and knew them not, but asked the Angel: Zach. 6. 4. *What are theſe, my Lord?* And 1.9. *O my Lord, what are theſe?* And 4. 5, 6. *Knoweſt thou not what theſe things be? And I ſaid, No my Lord. Then he anſwered and ſpake unto me, ſaying, This is, &c.* See the like in the 13 and 14 verſes.

Pharaoh, Nabuchodonoſor, and Caiaphas did apprehend, but not underſtand things divine: Prophets underſtood almoſt alwayes, ſaith Caſtrus: *Alwayes,* ſay I, *within a ſhort while; ſo that they were never left wholly neſcient of what they propheſied.*

Aquinas, 2^a, $2^æ$, *quaſt.* 173. *artic.* 4. cometh home to me in the queſtion propounded and in the cloſe, though he holdeth ſomewhat aloof in the bodie of the Article. His *Quære* is, *Utrùm Prophetæ ſemper cognoſcant ea quæ prophetant? VVhether the Prophets alwayes underſtand all things which they propheſie?* and at firſt he reſolveth, [t] *It is not neceſſarie that they ſhould know whatſoever they foretell.* I confeſſe there is no abſolute neceſſitie of it; and the *Non oportet* makes another diſtinct queſtion: But againſt my poſition *detur* Ἔνστασις, *give me one inſtance.* He proves it by Caiaphas, who knew not what he propheſied. It is anſwered before; He was no Prophet, though he ſpake a propheticall ſentence, no more then Balaams aſſe was a man, becauſe he once diſcourſed more wiſely then his maſter. Aquinas addeth, and that truely, *That the Spirit moved the mindes of the ſouldiers to part Chriſts garments; but they knew not what it ſignified.* But this is farre from our queſtion: for neither were they Prophets, nor ſpake any propheticall ſentence; but onely fulfilled one. Three Arguments he bringeth unanſwerable for my opinion.

1. *Auguſtinus ſuper Geneſ. ad litteram* 12. 9. toward the beginning: [u] *VVho ſaw by the Spirit heavenly viſions in and by the glaſſe of bodily reſemblances, unleſſe there were added alſo the uſe, employment, and offices of the minde, whereby thoſe things may be underſtood, he deſerveth not the name of a Prophet: But thoſe things that are underſtood are not unknown: Therefore the Prophet is not ignorant of what he propheſieth.* 2. *Great-*

[r] *Non ad Prophetæ rationem id ſemper exigitur & neceſſarium eſt, ut quæ futura denuntiat intelligat: habuit Daniel complures viſiones quas primùm non intellexit; ſed ab Angelo poſtea eſt edoctus, & nomen Prophetæ non perdidit.*

[s] *Ut per moram occaſio darentur, amplius Deum deprecandi, & lacrymis & jejunio invocandi Deum, ut mitteret Angelum ſuum qui doceret Danielem.*

[t] *Non oportet Prophetas quæcunq; prædicunt cognoſcere.*

[u] *Quibus ſigna per aliquas rerum corporalium ſimilitudines demonſtrabantur in Spiritu, niſi acceſſiſſet mentis officium, ut etiam intelligerentur, nondum erat prophetia. Sed ea quæ intelliguntur, non poſſunt eſſe incognita: Ergò Propheta non ignorat ea quæ prophetat.*

x *Majus eſt lumen prophetiæ, quàm lumen naturalis rationis: Sed quicunque lumine naturali habet ſcientiam, non ignorat ea quæ ſcit: Ergò quicunque lumine prophetico aliqua enuntiat, non poteſt ea ignorare.*

2. x *Greater and brighter is the divine light of propheſie, then the light of naturall reaſon: But by naturall reaſon we are not ignorant of thoſe things which we know: Therefore whoſoever is inſpired with the ſpirit of propheſie, cannot be ignorant of ſuch things as he propheſieth of.*

y *Prophetia ordinatur ad hominum illuminationem: Unde dicitur, 2. Pet. 1. 19.* HABEMUS PROPHETICUM SERMONEM, CUI BENEFACITIS ATTENDENTES, QUASI LUCERNÆ LUCENTI IN CALIGINOSO LOCO. *Sed nihil poteſt alios illuminare, niſi in ſe ſit illuminatum: Ergò videtur quòd Propheta priùs illuminetur, ad cognoſcendum ea quæ aliis enuntiat.*

3. y *Propheſie is ordained as a means to inſtruct and inlighten mens underſtandings: whereupon it is ſaid, 2. Pet. 1. 19.* WE HAVE A MORE SURE WORD OF PROPHESIE, WHEREUNTO YE DO WELL THAT YE TAKE HEED, AS UNTO A LIGHT THAT SHINETH IN A DARK PLACE: *But nothing can irradiate or give light unto others, that is not illuminated in it ſelf: Therefore it ſeems that a Prophet is firſt inlightened himſelf, to know thoſe things which he fore-divineth to others.* His onely anſwer to the objections is, that the three reaſons ſpeak of true Prophets, whoſe minde is from heaven perfectly inlightened: Which is wholly my concluſion, except he differ from me in this, That the mindes of the true Prophets are not perfectly inlightened in the things which they do propheſie: which his words may inſinuate, and my opinion contradicteth. It is true, that Faith is of thoſe things that are not ſeen; Hope is of thoſe things that are not had or enjoyed; Propheſie is of thoſe things that are not, but are to come: and things to come are as eaſily known *lumine propheticò, by the light of propheſie*, as preſent colours are diſcerned *lumine naturali, by the light of nature:* But that propheſie is of things hidden from the true Prophet, evinceth that a *Prophet* and a *Seer* are not all one; and what I ſay concerning whatſoever the Prophets ſpake or writ, I ſay alſo of all other Penmen of holy Scripture; They knew what they ſpake, they knew what they wrote; even S. Paul that *heard unſpeakable words, which it is not lawfull for a man to utter*, 2. Cor. 12. 4. out of doubt underſtood whatſoever was ſaid unto him: He ſaith not, he heard words *that he could not underſtand*; but words *unſpeakable.*

Three Objections follow: two brought by Caſtrus, but not anſwered; the third is drawn from divers paſſages of the Apoſtles.

z *Propheta quædam intelligebant, quædam non intelligebant.*

Object. 1. Auguſtine, *de Civit. 7. 33.* ſaith, z *The Prophets did underſtand ſome things, and not underſtand other things.*

It is true, No one of them knew all things, but ſome things were revealed to one, ſome to another, in ſeverall times, places, manners, and degrees: but Auguſtine will not ſay, that the holy Prophets were ignorant of what they propheſied themſelves, and were to teach others. Eliſha knew not the cauſe of the womans coming to him, 2. King. 4. 27. and till the minſtrell played, the hand of the Lord came not on him, 2. King. 3. 15. but the ſame Eliſha knew, not onely things to come,

come, but alſo things contingent, and which did never come to paſſe: Whereas Joas ſmote but thrice upon the ground, Eliſha knew by the ſpirit of propheſie, that if Joas had ſmitten five or ſix times, then had he ſmitten Syria till he had conſumed it, 2. Kings 13.19. Now let any one think the Prophets to be parcell-ignorant in their own propheſies, I will not.

Object. 2. Ambroſe, *de Abraham*, 1. 8. ſaith, Abraham propheſied he knew not what, when he ſpake to his young men, Gen. 22.5. *Abide you here with the aſſe, and I and the lad will go yonder and worſhip, and come again to you.*

Melchior Canus, *de locis Theologicis*, 2. 4. *in initio*, ſaith, *Sunt alii quibus ego vehementer aſſentior, qui admittunt Abraham mentitum fuiſſe; Others admit that Abraham told a lie, to whom I ſtrongly adhere.* I anſwer in generall, Canus had done better if he had followed them, [a] *Who religiouſly and gravely contend* (as himſelf ſpeaketh) *that Abraham lied not.* I anſwer more particularly, The plurall might be uſed for the ſingular, or he might think reſervedly, If God will, If we both live. Either of theſe wayes is better then that of Canus. But the truth is, The father of the faithfull knew, that though himſelf did kill Iſaac, yet God who *is able of ſtones to raiſe up children unto Abraham*, Matth. 3.9. *was able to raiſe up Iſaac even from the dead*, Heb. 11.19. and in hope or full aſſurance thereof might ſay, *I and the lad will return*; and yet intend faithfully to ſacrifice his ſonne. And who knoweth but he might be divinely and extraordinarily aſſured, that his childe ſhould return with him?

[a] *Qui piè gravitérque contendunt, Abraham non eſſe mentitum.*

The third Objection conſiſteth of theſe parcels: 1. Pet. 5. 12. *By Silvanus a faithfull brother unto you, as I ſuppoſe.* 2. Cor. 11. 5. *I ſuppoſe I was not a whit behinde the very chiefeſt Apoſtles.* In both places is uſed the word λογίζομαι, *computo, ſupputo: Exiſtimo*, ſaith the Vulgat, *I ſuppoſe.* 1. Cor. 7.40. Δοκῶ δὲ κἀγὼ πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἔχειν, *I think I have the Spirit of God.* Joh. 21.25. *There are many other things which Jeſus did, the which if they ſhould be written, I ſuppoſe that even the world it ſelf could not contain the books that ſhould be written:* δοκῶ, *arbitror, I opine, think*, or *ſuppoſe.* From which or the like places the objection thus ariſeth; Opinion is converſant about thoſe things which are changeable; and is onely of all the powers of the ſoul buſied about contingents; and is a trembling, pendulous, ſhaking and uncertain habit, *circa complexa:* upon probable reaſons inclining to one ſide; yet fearing or doubting the contradictorie: for *opinion* is framed on *likelihood*, as *knowledge* is upon *truth.* Where *opinion* or *ſuppoſall* is, there is not *certain knowledge:* But our Apoſtles did *think* or *ſuppoſe:* Therefore they had not *immediate divine revelation* or *certaintie* in the points ſuppoſed, and therefore wrote ſomewhat which they knew not.

I anſwer

I anſwer to each of theſe Apoſtles in particular: and firſt to S. Peter, who ſeemeth to be in doubt and uncertainty what was to be thought concerning Silvanus.

Divers ſay, he ſpeaketh modeſtly of him, as the Apoſtolicall men were wont to do of themſelves. S. Auguſtine, *Tract. 37. in Joan.* averreth, that under thoſe words is couched an aſſeveration: As if one ſhould ſay to a ſtubborn ſervant, *Thou doſt contemn me: Conſider; I ſuppoſe I am thy maſter:* where the ſeeming ſuppoſall makes him neither to be, nor ſeem to be ever a whit the leſſe his maſter. But I anſwer, That the holy Ghoſt having not revealed unto S. Peter fully what the heart of Silvanus was, or was like to be, left him to ſuppoſe; and according to the ſuppoſall of his ſoul, did dictate unto S. Peter (what the bleſſed Spirit knew better then S. Peter) theſe words. The ſuppoſall of the Apoſtle inferreth not a ſuppoſall of the Spirit; The Spirit was moſt certain when the Apoſtle might be dubious: The holy Ghoſt ſpake (if I may ſo ſay) repreſenting Peter, and in Peters perſon; which might be ſubject to a ſuppoſall, and yet divinely inſpired to know certainly what he wrote, namely to know this, that he did ſuppoſe. And that upon good motives.

Whereas S. Paul ſaith, 2. Cor. 11. 5. *I ſuppoſe I was not a whit behinde the very chiefeſt Apoſtles:* and 1. Cor. 7. 40. *I think I have the Spirit of God*; he ſpeaketh not ſo much *doubtingly* as *humbly*. To uſe diminuent and ſparing phraſes concerning ones ſelf is lawfull: 2. Cor. 11. 23. *I ſpeak as a fool*, ſaith S. Paul; yet there was as great a diſſimilitude between a fool and him, as between any (I think) then breathing. Epheſ. 3. 8. Ἐμοὶ τῷ ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ, *Unto me who am leſſe then the leaſt of all Saints, is this grace given, that I ſhould preach among the Gentiles the unſearchable riches of Chriſt.* No man had the like priviledge in every degree, as he had in this. S. Peter was *Doctor Judæorum, the Doctour of the Jews*; S. Paul *Doctor Gentium, the Doctour of the Gentiles:* yet no man can ſpeak more modeſtly then S. Paul doth of himſelf: *Leſſe then the leaſt of the Apoſtles*, had been much; but *leſſe then the leaſt of all Saints*, is the depth, the heart, the ſoul of humilitie: which yet is further evidenced, in that he ſaith not, this grace was given when he was a perſecuter, and ſo indeed worſe then any Saint, yea almoſt worſe then any man; but to me even now when I am called, now when I am turned; to me now *leſſe then the leaſt of all Saints, is this grace given. Leſſe then the leaſt* is contrary to the rules of Grammar, which admit not a comparative above a ſuperlative; contrary to common ſenſe; contrary to the literall truth of the things themſelves: for he was *a choſen veſſell, a chief Apoſtle*; few (if any) more chief: *though he ſhould boaſt more of his authoritie, he ſhould not be aſhamed*,

2. Cor.

2. Cor. 10. 8. *No whit inferiour* οὐδὲν ὑστέρησα, *to the very chiefeſt Apoſtles*, 2. Cor. 12. 11. *A Miniſter of Chriſt more then others*, 2. Cor. 11. 23: Now though S. Paul uſed *terminis diminuentibus*, and ſpake ſparingly and modeſtly in ſome places concerning himſelf; yet otherwhere he revealeth the whole truth; he knew the certaintie of things, to wit, that he was not leſſe then the leaſt, that he was not as a fool: and when he ſaid, *I ſuppoſe*, or *I think*, he did *know*. *Dum minus dicit, majus innuit: Whileſt he ſpeaketh the leſſe, he intimateth the more:* he was never a trumpeter of his own worth, but when he was urged unto it by oppoſition.

Concerning the place of S. John thus I anſwer: The Apoſtle was governed by the holy Ghoſt, to uſe an *Hyperbole*, or αὔξησις, according to the Orientall Idiotiſme; and perchance aimed at the words, Gen. 13. 6. *The land was not able to bear Abraham and Lot, that they might dwell together:* Or at the place of Amos 7.10. *The land is not able to bear all his words*; as is well obſerved by the curious Heinſius. He alſo here is guided by the ſame Spirit, to write, *I ſuppoſe*, or *I think, that even the world could not contain the books:* as for other reaſons to us unknown, ſo perhaps becauſe both the Spirit would qualifie the *Hyperbole*, and ſpeak within truth which is allowed, rather then beyond truth which is diſallowable: *I ſuppoſe*, rather then *I know*.

Secondly, I anſwer more punctually; If the holy Spirit did leave S. Paul neſcient, whether he were rapt in bodie, yea or no; and Paul did know his own neſciencie, 2. Cor. 12. 2. why might not the ſame Spirit leave S. Paul, S. Peter, S. John in ſuppoſals? and yet no inconvenience ariſeth thencefrom, ſince they perfectly knew that they did ſuppoſe. *This is the diſciple which teſtifieth of theſe things, and wrote theſe things; and we know that his teſtimonie is true*, John 21. 24. as S. John ſaith of himſelf.

To conclude this point; No man ever ſaid, that whatſoever the holy Penmen mentioned or treated of, they underſtood perfectly, inveſted with all their circumſtances: for they ſpake and writ of the day of judgement, and other ſecret viſions, whoſe depths were never ſounded by meer man; but ſealed and reſerved, perchance from Angels, till the generall judgement: yet whatſoever matter, ſentences, and words they wrote, they knew as they were writers thereof, and were in no doubt of them, nor could they miſtake them. As they were not omniſcient on the one ſide; ſo were they not ignorant on the other ſide: but whatſoever they ſpake or wrote they knew, and knew much more then ever they ſpake or wrote.

The ſixth queſtion followeth, *viz.* Whether the holy Penmen did reade profane authours?

Upon the premiſall of ſix points, the anſwer will be moſt expedite.

The firſt is this, *That diverſe Prophets and Penmen of the Old Teſtament, were Noble-men, Rulers, or Kings, cannot be denied by him, who thinketh of Iſaiahs birth of royall linage,* ſaith Hierom in the Prologue on him; and Lyranus from the Rabbins; or on David, Solomon, and others.

Secondly, That diverſe alſo were learned before their calling to publick place, is moſt apparent. Thus Moſes *was learned in all the wiſdome of the Egyptians, and was mightie in words and deeds,* Act.7.22. and this before he was called to his publick charge. Thus was Job skilled in Aſtronomie, as his words declare; and Solomon the beſt Philoſopher (as I think) that ever was, except Chriſt and Adam; though Solomons great learning was rather infuſed then acquired.

The third *puncto* is, That no Penmen of the New Teſtament were Noble: And perchance even therefore our Bleſſed Saviour would write nothing by himſelf in perſon, becauſe he was of the bloud-royall. S. Hierom in his Epiſtle to Principia the Virgin, ſaith, *S. John was Noble, and for his Nobilitie known to the high Prieſt.* I anſwer, that he was very neare of kindred to our Bleſſed Saviour, and therefore Noble; but that ever he was nobly bred or brought up according to the uſance of the world, or that he was by his nobilitie made known to the high Prieſt, I ſee not proved. S. Paul ſaith, 1.Cor.1.26. *Ye ſee your calling, brethren, how that not many wiſe men after the fleſh, not many mightie, not many noble are called:* and verſ.28. *God hath choſen the baſe things of the world, and things which are deſpiſed.* If any one object, Though there were not many noble called, yet S. John might be one: Eſtius is peremptorie, that [b] *Not one of the twelve Apoſtles, according to the world, was wiſe, powerfull, or noble.* Ambroſe, *lib.5. in Luc. ad illud Capitis ſexti,* 13. ELEGIT EX IPSIS, thus, [c] *Obſerve the providence of God: He choſe not any wiſe, nor rich, nor noble, but he elected fiſhers and Publicanes: and them he inſtructed, leſt he might ſeem to have drawn men unto him by worldly wiſdome, or to have redeemed them by wealth, or to have allured them to his ſide and to the participation of his grace, by the reconciling authoritie of power and nobilitie.*

The 1. Cor.4.11. the Apoſtle ſpeaketh in the perſon of all his fellows, thus, *Even to this preſent houre we both hunger and thirſt, and are naked, and are buffetted, and have no certain dwelling place; and labour, working with our own hands, &c.* which things the Noble of this world will neither do nor ſuffer: Therefore they were not Noble.

The fourth thing premiſable is this, *None of the twelve Apoſtles were learned before their calling.* S. Paul indeed was *brought up*

[b] *Inter duodecim Chriſti Apoſtolos nullus erat ſecundum ſeculum ſapiens, potens, nobilis.*
[c] *Adverte cœleſte conſilium: non ſapientes aliquos, non divites, non nobiles, ſed piſcatores & Publicanos, quos dirigeret, elegit; nè traduxiſſe prudentiâ, nè redemiſſe divitiis, nè potentiæ nobilitatiſque authoritate traxiſſe aliquos ad ſuam gratiam videretur.*

up at the feet of Gamaliel, Act. 22.3. and S. Luke, as being a Phyſician, might be learned ere he was a Chriſtian: the like might be ſurmiſed of S. Mark; and the rather, becauſe we reade not that the gift of tongues was given to theſe two. Concerning S. Matthew, though there may be ſome probabilitie that he was learned before his vocation, becauſe he ſat at the receit of cuſtome, Matth. 9.9. for few unlearned men were gatherers of Ceſars cuſtomes or tributes: and though Publicanes were vilely eſteemed of among the Jews, yet divers paſſages of Cicero do ſhew, that they were of good account among the Romanes: and though more particularly it is obſerved, Luk. 5.29. that *Levi* (or *Matthew*) *made Chriſt a great feaſt in his own houſe; and there was a great companie of Publicanes and of others that ſat down with them*; whence may be inferred, that S. Matthew was a rich man; yet notwithſtanding all this, he might be unlearned; and a poore man might make a great feaſt for joy of his extraordinarie calling. See what the young, perhaps, poore plough-man Eliſha did, 1. King. 19.21.

Joh. 7.15. the Jews ſay of Chriſt, *How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?* The Prieſts, Scribes, and Phariſees knew Chriſt frequented not their ſchools, no not thoſe at Jeruſalem (for Franciſcus Lucas Brugenſis calleth them *Schools*) pointed at, Luk. 2.46. which were in the Temple, and at the outwardeſt Eaſtern gate of it; I ſay, Chriſt frequented them not to learn; but he at twelve yeares of age went and heard the Doctours, and asked them queſtions; and belike, when they could not anſwer, he did; or els, perhaps, he did anſwer to other queſtions propounded by them: for *all that heard him* (even they with whom he diſputed) *were aſtoniſhed at his underſtanding and anſwers*, Luk. 2.47. John 7.27. *We know this man whence he is*, ſay the Jews. As if one be eminent among us, we uſually enquire of his parents, of his breeding, and whole courſe of life: ſo in likelihood they did of Chriſt: They knew his breeding in the citie of Nazareth; *Where from his childhood he uſed a mechanicall trade with his ſuppoſed father*, ſaith Pererius: They ſaw him not poring on books, nor tumbling them over, nor for ſtudies ſake reſorting to any places where religion was taught; yet they heard him, *Legis teſtimonia proferentem, Alledge the words of the Law. They did not admire his doctrine* (ſay Chryſoſtom, Euthymius, and Theophylact) *nor beleeved they it; but they were aſtoniſhed at his eloquence and learning, acknowledging them rather inſpired then acquired. From whence hath this man theſe things? and what wiſdome is this which is given unto him?* ſay they, Mark 6.2. As Chriſt never went to any Schools, no more (in all likelihood) did any of his twelve Apoſtles; who being poore tradeſmen, may well be thought unlettered: Matth. 4.21. even *John, and his brother*

James, with their father Zebedee, were mending their nets; whereby their povertie and mean calling was deſcribed. Their ignorance is taxed by the Jews, John 7.49. *This people, who knoweth not the Law, are curſed:* where his diſciples are held as illiterate ignorants. And for this cauſe, I think, Chriſt choſe not either Nicodemus, or Joſeph of Arimathea, or the Lawyer which offered to follow him, or Scribe, Prieſt, or Phariſee, to be any one of his Apoſtles; that Apoſtolicall learning might be rather Divine, then Humane: in which regard alſo, perhaps, he choſe none of the Doctours with whom he argued: ſure I am, S. Auguſtine ſaith, for this very cauſe Nathanael was not numbred among the twelve Apoſtles, *Quia doctus erat in lege, Because he was a learned Lawyer*; though otherwiſe Nathanael was a moſt accompliſhed man. Act. 4. 13. it is ſaid, That the high Prieſts, Rulers, and Elders *perceived that Peter and John were unlearned and ignorant men:* Unlearned in the knowledge of things themſelves; ignorant in skilfull ſpeaking: ſimple men both for matter and manner. And *this the Jews perceived, that is, by diſquiſition found out*, ſaith Lorinus.

Auguſtine, *de Verb. Domini, Serm.* 59. *Tom.* 10. [d] *Great was the mercie of Chriſt: He knew if he had choſen a Senatour, the Senatour would have ſaid, I was choſen for my place and dignitie: If an Oratour, he would have pleaded, My eloquence hath made me regarded: If a Philoſopher, My wiſdome cauſed me to be choſen. Give me the Fiſherman: Come thou poore man; thou haſt nothing, knoweſt nothing; follow me. Put me an empty veſſel where is ſo great a ſpring. The words of Fiſhermen are read onely, and the necks of Oratours are ſubject unto them.* Or (as Athanaſius, *de Incarnat. & Sacrament. cap.* 9. hath it) [e] *The plain down-right truth of Fiſhermen, hath thruſt out of doores the oratorie of Philoſophers.*

Lorinus, on Act. 1. 26. relateth the opinion of Antoninus, thus, *That Chriſt whileſt he lived choſe rude and illiterate men, leſt the converſion of the world ſhould be attributed to humane induſtry and wiſdome: yet the Apoſtles choſe the learned Matthias, to inſinuate unto the ſucceeding Churches, That not idiots, but skilfull men were to be choſen Governours of ſouls; Yea, even Chriſt himſelf from heaven, vocally called the learned S. Paul.* And ſo I ſhake hands with this point.

The fifth followeth, *viz.* That it was lawfull for them, and is for others, to reade, or ſeek profane Authours.

The arts are as handmaids to Divinitie. Clemens Alexandrinus, *primo Stromat.* ſaith, [f] *The arts are as a Schoolmaſter to bring the Gentiles to Chriſt, as the Law was to the Jews.* Though the Apoſtle ſaith, *Beware leſt any man ſpoil you through Philoſophie,* (Col. 2. 8.) yet it is that Philoſophie which is joyned with vain deceit. *True Philoſophie is a branch plucked from the eternal Veritie* (ſaith Clemens in the ſame place) *and is the childe of rectified reaſon.* But [g] *even Jupiter is ruled by good reaſon,* ſaith

[d] *Magna artificis miſericordia: ſciebat enim, quòd ſi eligeret Senatorem, diceret Senator, Dignitas mea electa eſt: ſi Oratorem, Eloquentia mea: ſi Philoſophum, Sapientia mea electa eſt. Da mihi iſtum piſcatorem: veni tu pauper; nihil habes, nihil vôſti; ſequere me. Tam largo fonti vas inane admovendum eſt. Leguntur modò verba piſcatorum, & ſubduntur colla Oratorum.*

[e] *Verba Philoſophorum excludit ſimplex veritas piſcatorum.*

[f] *Non minùs literas illas Gentilibus ad Chriſtum pædagogi vice, quàm legem Judæis eſſe*

[g] *Recta ratio eſt lex ſummi Jovis.*

saith Cicero: and Tertullian, more African-like, [h] *God and reason are at one.* When any Fathers tax Philosophie, it is because it cometh too nigh the Mountain, and intermingleth with Divinitie: otherwise, it is lawfull to use it, or any other profane authoritie. See it proved by Nicephorus, 10.26. Gregorie Nazianzen defendeth S. Basil for his learning in Ethnicks, and censureth those that condemn it, saying; *The aire, the earth, are not to be contemned, because some have abused them. Fire, meat, iron, & other things,* [i] *of themselves are neither profitable nor harmfull, but as they are used. As we make Theriacall medicaments of creeping things: so let us choose the good things out of them, and contemn the bad;* [k] *making the profane things to be sanctified and ecclesiasticall,* saith Origen, *Homil. 31. in Luc.* Hierom well observeth in the beginning of his Commentaries on Daniel, and in his Preface on Job, That, if you look over all the books of Philosophie, you must needs finde in them [l] *some part of the chosen truths of God.* In Plato, God to be the Architect of the world: in the Stoicall Zeno, Hell, and the immortalitie of souls. *We are to vindicate their good things from them, as from unjust possessours, and to transfer the spoils of Egypt to our selves,* as Augustine sweetly alludeth, *de doctr. Christ.* 2.40. When Ruffinus accused Hierom for using in his letters humane learning, Hierom *Epist.*8. answereth, That *that is to kill Goliah with his own sword,* 1.Sam. 17.51. *Let Philosophie submit her self, as Agar to Sara,* saith Clemens *ibid.* Let the captive womans head be shaved, and her nails pared, Deut.21.12. If the handmaid be obstinate, *Cast out this bondwoman and her sonne,* Gen. 21. 10. [m] *Why do we refuse secular learning, without which we cannot comprehend things divine?* saith Tertullian, *de Idololat.* And Aquinas most divinely in his disputed questions *de fide, Art.*10. [n] *Divinitie is never contrarie to true naturall reason, but often excelleth it; and so going beyond it, doth seem to thwart it.* And so this fifth point, *That it was and is lawfull to reade profane Authours,* is the rather concluded, because it shall be confirmed by the sixth,

The holy Penmen did cite Poets or profane Authours.

Titus 1. 12. *One of themselves, even a Prophet of their own, said,*

Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί·

Cretenses semper mendaces, malæ bestiæ, ventres pigri:

The Cretians are alway liars, evil beasts, slow bellies.

Epimenides the Cretian in his book περὶ χρησμῶν, *de Oraculis*, hath the whole Hexameter: Callimachus came after him, and from him took the Hemistich: But the whole verse was not taken by S. Paul from Callimachus, because the whole verse was not intire in Callimachus: Besides, *Callimachus was of Cyrene, not of Creet.* The learned Estius is my authour.

The same S. Paul cites this (as it is Act.17.28,29.) *In him*

[h] *Res Dei Ratio.*

[i] *Per se sunt neque utilia neque noxia.*

[k] *Sanctificantes profana & facientes ecclesiastica.*

[l] *Aliquam partem vasorum Dei.*

[m] *Quomodo repudiamus secularia studia, sine quibus divina esse non possunt?*

[n] *Rationi naturali veræ nunquam contrariatur Theologia; sed eam excedit sæpe, & sic videtur repugnare.*

we live, move, and have our being, as certain alſo of your own Poets have ſaid: For we are alſo his off-ſpring. In which diſcourſe S. Paul inſiſts in the writings of diverſe of their Prophets. Firſt, verſ.24. *God made the world, and all things therein*; which almoſt all Heathen acknowledged, and many have publiſhed: verſ. 26. *He hath made of one bloud all nations of men:* Orpheus compriſed both of them before in few words,

Unus perfectus per ſe; ex uno omnia facta:
He is one and perfect of himſelf; and by or *of that one were all things made.* Verſ.28. ſeemeth to be taken from Xenophanes Colophonius, who cometh home to that point, as he is cited by Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromat.* 5. or els from Orpheus, who acknowledgeth that in God

——————cuncta moventur,
Ignis, aqua, & tellus,——————
All things are moved, Fire, water, earth.

Concerning thoſe words, verſ.29. *We are his off-ſpring*; they are the very words of Aratus in the beginning almoſt of his φαινόμενα· Τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν, *Ipſius enim genus ſumus, We are his off-ſpring.* Clemens *Strom.* 5. and Vaſques, *Tom.* 1. *part.* 1. *diſputat.* 28. *num.* 17. expound it, as if we were his *Genus Creatione, By creation.* That is true, but not enough: for *Genus* may be taken for *Soboles, an off-ſpring*; and men may be ſaid to be Διογενεῖς, *Jovis proles, Born of God, The iſſue of God*; or, as another hath it to an other purpoſe,

Semideíque homines, ſemihominéſque dei:
Men half gods, and gods half men.

Another place in S. Paul, is 1. Cor. 15. 33,

φθείρουσιν ἤθη χρησὰ ὁμιλίαι κακαί·
Evil communications corrupt good manners.

Tertullian, *ad uxorem*, 1.7. ſaith, *This verſicle was ſanctified by the Apoſtle.* Hierom, *ad Demetriad. virg. Epiſt.* 8. *cap.* 10. ſaith, *S. Paul aſſuming this ſecular verſe, made it Eccleſiaſticall.* Socrates, 3.40. and out of him Nicephorus 10.26. ſay, *It is borrowed from Euripides.* Hierom, Peter Martyr, and many mo report it to be *Senarius Menandri, an Hexameter of Menander.* I reconcile them thus, That it is in both of the Poets. Juſtinian the Jeſuite relateth, that Photius, *apud Oecumenium*, ſaith, *Some ſuch thing is in the Prophet Iſaiah*; But *I could never finde it*, ſaith the Jeſuite. Perhaps he miſtook Photius; for if Photius had any relation to the precedent words, verſ. 32. *Let us eat and drink, for to morrow we die*; the Jeſuite might finde the ſame Iſa. 22. 13. And ſo Athanaſius, on the place of the Apoſtle (or rather Theophylact, if we beleeve Bellarmine, *de Scriptoribus Eccleſiaſticis, ad annum* 340. *in Athanaſio*) ſaith, *Thoſe words were taken from Iſaiah.*

Acts 20. 28. *Take heed unto your ſelves, and to all the flock;*

Atten-

Attendite vobis, &c. That Thales Milesius was the first that said, *Non sine oculo Domini (.i. attentione) equum; non sine vestigio Domini, (*id est, *attentione) agrum pingueſcere,* was a good observation of Bishop Andrews in his *Concio ad Clerum, in Synodo Provinciali, pag.* 29: but that grave Prelates intimation (for indeed at the utmost it is no more) that Paul alluded to that saying of Thales, is a conjecture farre enough fetched. *Eodémque in loco, Paulus (jam Milesius) Nec, sine attentione, bene esse Ecclesiæ dicit.* So he. Much more may be said to the point concerning the Apostles citing Apocryphall, or not Canonicall writings.

S. Paul knew the names of Pharaoh his Magicians, 2. Tim. 3. 8. *Jannes and Jambres,* as we reade it according to the Greek and Syriack; which is also followed by Numenius *apud Euseb. de præparat. Evangel.* 9. 3. though the Vulgat hath *Mambres* in stead of *Jambres,* and the Hebrew Talmud, and Rabbi Nathan, as Genebrard cites them in the first book of his Chronologie. ° *It is commonly thought that the Apostle took from the Talmud the names of Pharaohs chief Magicians,* saith Drusius, *in Henoch, pag.*25. and in the margin, ᵖ *It is more credible the Apostle took it out of an Apocryphall book, called* JANNES AND MAMBRES: *for from thence the Talmud fetched it,* saith Drusius. I for my part will not define whether S. Paul was onely immediately from heaven assured, that these were the names of the Magicians; or whether he had read their names also in some Apocryphall book now perished, or in the Talmud.

° *Apostolus è Talmud habet nomina principum Magorum Pharaonis, ut communis opinio est.*

ᵖ *Credibilius est, ipsum sumpsisse ex libro Apocrypho, qui* Jannes & Mambres *vocatur; nam Talmud indè habuit.*

James 1.17. Πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ, καὶ πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον &c.

Every good gift, and every perfect gift is from above: Which words I have both heard and read alledged for the lawfull use of humane literature; though I, for my part, cannot guesse whence the Apostle took them.

That S. Jude had the historie of the strife between Michael and the devil, about the bodie of Moses (the 9 of Jude) in part from Deuteronomie, and in part from an Apocryphall book, Aretius maintaineth: The title of the book was *Assumptio Mosis, The assumption of Moses* (as some say;) or, *Ascensio Mosis, The ascent of Moses,* as others say. That S. Jude might also have read the book of Henoch and his prophesie, I will not denie: for he citeth some words of it, vers.14. So think Hierom *in Catalogo,* and in his Commentarie on Titus 1. Augustine *de Civitat.* 15. 23. *&* *ibid.* 18. 38. and Beda on the place. But the book of Henoch is Apocryphall.

That S. John read the Targumists, in many places, the learned Heinsius proveth or laboureth to prove by many passages. Thus much clearly must be confest, that the gifts both of reading, and of writing, and understanding of strange tongues

was conferred on all the Apoſtles; not one was an illiterate man, after the *cloven tongues like as of fire ſat upon each of them*, Act. 2.3. and I make no queſtion but they alſo read the Old Teſtament, after that time, and might reade other books, Talmudiſts, Targumiſts, Helleniſts, Apocryphall books, yea Heathen writings; and perhaps did ſo.

But in all theſe or the like places, which the Apoſtles cited or pointed at, this is now my laſt reſolution, as a Corollarie to the Queſtion before briefly anſwered,

Either the ſacred Penmen never read thoſe things themſelves, but the all-knowing Spirit did tender and dictate both matter and words to them: Or if they did reade profane authours, and were converſant in them; yet they uſed the words, not as their own reading, not as humane learning, not as drawn out of the treaſurie of their own memories, not as if they had the choice to inſert thoſe ſentences above others; but the holy Ghoſts inſpiration guided them wholly, and reached forth words unto them, both in things which they knew, and in things unknown unto them before.

Yea, *I* beleeve, that if Plato, or Ariſtotle, Tullie, or Varro had lived after Chriſts dayes, and been called to write any part of Scripture, they ſhould not, would not have conceived one thought, or written one word of humane literature, as from themſelves, or any part of their own great knowledge; but would have quitted themſelves, and been wholly led by the holy Ghoſt.

The ſeventh Queſtion. Whether they ſtudied the things before-hand?

That both Prophets, Apoſtles, and Evangeliſts, were filled with holy thoughts, and heavenly meditations, we certainly beleeve and know. Pſal. 45. 1. *My heart is enditing of a good matter*; or (as it is in our margin) *boyleth*, or *bubbleth up a good matter: Eructavit cor meum verbum bonum*, ſaith the Vulgat; *Verily good thoughts were in my heart:* The like I ſay of all, and every of them. Pſal. 39. 2. *I was dumbe with ſilence, I held my peace even from good, and my ſorrow was ſtirred:* and verſ. 3. *My heart was hot within me, while I was muſing the fire burned; then ſpake I with my tongue:* and verſ. 4. *Lord, make me to know mine end.* From whence appeareth, that David was premeditating, as other people do: and at the laſt, as other mens, his thoughts brake forth. The ſimilitude is taken from ſorrow and grief, which being for a while ſuppreſſed, groweth greater; or from fire, which being ſmothered, or half quenched with water, upon recovery of its ſtrength, groweth farre more violent. The anſwer is, that David relateth what courſe he took when he could not exonerate and alleviate his ſoul by conference with men, whoſe wayes he liked not: *He poured*

out

out his complaints and prayers unto God: So Muſculus. And this no doubt did the Spirit of God ſtirre him up to do. It pleaſed the holy Ghoſt to make thoſe thoughts of David, which before were pure and divine, yet private, now to be divine, publick, and canonicall.

Again, That they might conceive and underſtand by the Spirit, a great deal more then the holy Ghoſt would have to be written, I denie not: and on ſuch things they might muſe.

Yet I conjecture, that what they wrote in holy Scripture, they ſtudied not before-hand (the Spirit hath no need of mans ſtudie or learning) and I do remove from every part of it, all humane premeditation; and maintain, that the Spirit did frame both matter and words (as by Gods grace ſhall anon appeare) *pro re nata, as occaſion offered it ſelf.*

One chief reaſon may be this, That nature, which is the right hand of God, hath greateſt care of greateſt matters, and leſſe of leaſt, and equall care of things equall. If the Apoſtolicall and Evangelicall writings are not (*conſideratis conſiderandis, weighing one thing with an other*) of more eſteem then their words were; yet let them go as equivalent: Then Chriſt will have as much care of their writings as of their ſpeaking: But their ſpeeches were without premeditation, and were commanded ſo to be: Therefore all their writings. Matth. 10. 19. *Take no thought how, or what ye ſhall ſpeak:* you ſee both the matter and manner is not to be from them. *For it is not ye that ſpeak, but the Spirit of your Father which ſpeaketh in you,* verſ. 20. *Not they,* there is the negative; *but the Spirit,* there is the poſitive. Likewiſe, Mark 13. 11. *Take no thought beforehand, —neither do ye premeditate:* An abſolute inhibition; and it had been a great ſinne to tranſgreſſe it, and a diſtruſt of the holy Ghoſt. The like I ſay concerning all their writings.

They might have indeed in their meditation before-hand divers of thoſe things which afterwards they wrote: but when they thought on them, they knew not they ſhould write them; and when they did write, they wrote them not as copies or extracts of former conceits out of the wombe of their own memories; but as freſhly and newly inſpired, apprehended, indited, and dictated unto them.

There is one kinde of knowledge proceeding from principles known by the naturall light of the intellect: as Arithmetick, Geometrie, &c. Others proceed out of principles known by light of an higher knowledge: as Perſpective, from the principles evinced by Geometrie; and Muſick, from principles known by Arithmetick: *So is the Scripture beleeved by an higher light, even by the revelation of God,* ſaith Aquin. *part.* 1. *quæſt.* 1. *art.* 2. and not beleeved onely; but the matter, and manner, and words proceeded from a diviner underſtanding, then

then humane conceit could reach unto; and were written by an higher and better hand then the hand of man. All was the holy Spirits doing, even the leading of their hands whileſt they wrote, that they could not erre.

Cornelius Cornelii à Lapide, on 2.Tim.3.16. thus, *The Spirit did not dictate all Scripture after one manner. The Law and the Propheſies are revealed and dictated to a word; the Hiſtories and Morall exercitations, which before by ſight, hearing, reading, or meditation the holy Writers had learned, there was no neceſsitie to be inſpired, or dictated from the Spirit; ſince they knew them alreadie: So John 19.35. He that ſaw it, bare record: and Luk.1.3. It ſeemed good to me alſo, having had perfect underſtanding of all things from the very firſt, to write unto thee in order:* Then doth he mince, modifie, and qualifie his former ſaying, in this manner; *But the holy Spirit may be ſaid to have dictated even the latter alſo: Firſt, becauſe* q *he was preſent whileſt they wrote, that they could not go one jot from the truth: Secondly, becauſe it ſtirred them up, and ſuggeſted that they ſhould write this rather then that:* r *Therefore the conceptions and remembrance of ſuch things as they knew, the Spirit did not inſpire into them.* Thirdly, ſaith he, *The Spirit did order, direct, and methodize all their conceits, that they might put this in the firſt, that in the ſecond, another in the third place.* In which words of his three things deſerve cenſure, even the ſtrict cenſure of the Inquiſition.

q *Aſtitit ſcribentibus nè vel in puncto à veritate aberrarent.*

r *Conceptum ergò, & memoriam eorum quæ ſciebant, non iis ingeſſit Spiritus Sanctus.*

Firſt, That the Spirit did not dictate all Scripture after one manner.

I anſwer, Then all is not of a like dignitie: that which is after the divineſt manner, is to be held beſt: that wherein there is a medly of divine and humane knowledge and wiſdome, is of an inferiour ſort. But this may not be granted; for, *All Scripture is of divine inſpiration.* Excellently ſaith Doctour Eſtius on 2.Tim.3.16. *Rightly and moſt truely from hence do we conclude, that all the ſacred Canonicall Scripture was written by the dictate of the holy Spirit;* (not in that manner, ſay I, that he left the Penmen to their own memories and knowledge, which as humane were weak and imperfect) but ſ *ſo, that not onely the ſentences, but every word, and the order, placing, and the whole diſpoſing of the words was from God, as ſpeaking or writing by himſelf.* But God (I dare ſay) hath no need of their memories; nor his writing or ſpeech, of their hearing, reading, ſight, or premeditation.

ſ *Ità nimirum, ut non ſolùm ſententiæ, ſed & verba ſingula, & verborum ordo, ac tota diſpoſitio ſit à Deo, tanquam per ſemetipſum ioquente aut ſcribente.*

Secondly, he is to be taxed for ſaying, there was no neceſſitie that things Morall and Hiſtoricall ſhould be inſpired.

I ſay, there was a neceſſitie that hiſtories and moralities ſhould be inſpired, if they are to be parts of the ſacred Writ: otherwiſe, this knowledge and writing are onely parcels of humane learning. Though S. John bare record to what he ſaw, his

his bearing record without the Spirit, had been but an ordinary teſtimonie. Not his ſaying, but the inſpiration makes the record divine: and his teſtimonie from the Spirit, That he ſaw, is of more force then his teſtimonie could be to the Spirit, What he ſaw. *It ſeemeth good unto me,* ſaith S. Luke; but it was made to ſeem good unto him by the Spirit: yea, firſt it ſeemed good unto the holy Ghoſt; as the Apoſtles in the like caſe ſaid, Act. 15. 28. *It ſeemed good unto the holy Ghoſt, and to us.* The words do not notifie the pleaſing of his own fancie, without the dictate of the holy Ghoſt, ſay I. And the underſtanding that he had of things from the firſt, was not by ſight; for he was not then called: nor by humane relation; for that may be miſtaken, increaſed, or decreaſed, or ſubject to errour. But the knowledge iſſued out from the light divine; and therefore is there tearmed *perfect underſtanding*; like Gods gifts, James 1. 17. All other guides are ſomewhat imperfect.

Thirdly, the Jeſuite is juſtly blameable for ſaying, The Spirit need not tell them what they knew before.

I ſay, they might have forgotten or miſtaken ſome things, as they were men; and by the Spirit they might know more certainly, what they knew before more doubtingly; and by the ſame Spirit they might know ſome circumſtances more then before they knew: what they knew *humanely*, they now know *divinely*.

I will not diſcuſſe the queſtion at large, Whether the Law written by the hand and finger of God immediately, were to be regarded above other things divinely inſpired into holy men, and written by them. This I will ſay, That if I were aſcertained that I ſaw the very tables, the latter tables of ſtone which God himſelf wrote; or if I had ſeen any thing which Chriſt himſelf had written (for I will not ſay he wrote nothing; and I know he could write) I ſhould prefer them ſomewhat above whatſoever ſhould be tranſcribed or written by any other whoſoever: and this is my reaſon; Though Moſes his writings were inſpired and dictated from God; yet he placed them in the ſide of the Ark, Deut. 31. 26. a place not altogether ſo noble: (ſee Cajetan on Heb. 9.) but the tables, and onely the tables written by Gods own finger, were laid up in the Ark it ſelf; as appeareth, 1. Kings 8. 9. and 2. Chron. 5. 10. howſoever afterward it ſeemeth there was a change, Hebr. 9. 4.

At length I am come to the five Concluſions, which beat directly upon the learned Heinſius: whereof the firſt is this,

There was no difference between the Penmen of the divine Writ of the Old and New Teſtament in the point of conceiving and writing in different languages. Which in this manner I do explain;

If

If I demand of the worthy Heinſius, in what tongue the Old Teſtament was conceived: his anſwer is peremptorie, *Prolegom. pag. 26.* [s] *It was conceived in the Hebrew and Chaldee language.* It had been clearer if he had uſed ſome disjunctive, rather then a copulative Prepoſition. For none will imagine that the skilfull Heinſius did ever mean, that all of the Old Teſtament was conceived both in Hebrew and in Chaldee, to which his words ſeem to incline: but either in Hebrew or in Chaldee was it conceived; and they who wrote in Hebrew conceived in Hebrew; and they who wrote in Chaldee conceived in Chaldee. I do not think but he would thus have expreſſed himſelf, and explained his own meaning, if he had been put unto it. Whereupon I diſcourſe in this manner: Jeremie wrote ſomewhat in Chaldee, and Daniel wrote ſome chapters: If they being Hebrews or Jews by generation and birth, and perfect in their mother-tongue, readie Scribes in the law of Moſes, as well as Ezra, Ezra 7.6. did yet conceive in the Chaldee, that Chaldee which they wrote (which the ingenuous Heinſius will not denie: for what was conceived in Chaldee, if that which was written in Chaldee was not ſo conceived?) why did not the Writers of the New Teſtament, though they were born and bred in the uſe of the Syriack, conceive in Greek what they wrote in Greek? What reaſon have we to diſcriminate them: ſo that the Penmen of the Old, ſhall conceive and write in one and the ſame language, the Chaldee in Chaldee, and Hebrew in Hebrew; and not the Penmen of the New Teſtament: but they (forſooth) muſt conceive in Syriack, and write or dictate in Greek? eſpecially ſince all of them conceived and wrote by the inſpiration and dictate of one and the ſame Spirit? Either let him make the forenamed paſſages of the Chaldee language in the Old Teſtament to be conceived in Hebrew, though writ in Chaldee; and ſo none at all to be conceived in Chaldee: or let him equall the Penmen of the New Law to thoſe of the Old in this point, That they wrote in the ſelf-ſame tongue in which they conceived.

[s] *Hebraâ ac Chaldaâ conceptum eſt linguâ.*

Beſides, it will be hard to prove, that Jeremie ever knew any part of the Chaldean language, till that very verſe was inſpired into him: and ſo with it, both the knowledge, and the words, and the power both of pronuntiation and of writing. So that Jeremie could not poſſibly conceive and utter alſo the Chaldee in the Hebrew; but conceived that verſe in Chaldee, and in Chaldee pronounced or wrote it.

A ſecond errour in the learned Heinſius, *Pag. 49. Prolegom.* is this, [t] *Wherefore we muſt reſt not on the alluſions which now are, but which S. John conceived in his minde.*

[t] *Quare ad alluſiones, non quæ extant, ſed quas animo conceperat Joannes, eundum eſt.*

Againſt which I ſet down the ſecond Concluſion; *viz.*

We

We muſt have recourſe to the alluſions which are. S. John was *Sol Evangelii, The light, the ſunſhine, the very Sunne of the Goſpel,* as Dionyſius termed him: This Sunne is in eclipſe, and we have not, cannot have his true and perfect light, if we muſt not look to his rayes and ſhine, which are his words; but to his thoughts, that is, the light which is in himſelf; to his *internall* and *ſubſtantiall* light, and not to the *externall.*

The certaineſt rule is moſt to be truſted unto: therefore let us not go from the words and extant alluſions which we know, to the thoughts of S. John which we know not. For, *Who knoweth the thoughts of a man, ſave the ſpirit of man which is in him?* 1. Cor. 2. 11. And if the finite thought of every man be unknown, can the thoughts of him, who is inſpired by the infinite Spirit, be ſo ſoon and ſo eaſily known? Moreover, the ſame words written in Greek may be conceived two or three wayes in the Syriack: for variations are in that language, and different expreſſions of the ſame things; And which of thoſe ſhall we think was the conceit of S. John? And when we have lighted on divers, and all of them good expreſſions of Syriack; yet the Spirit might guide S. John to an other, which we never thought upon: And ſo we are for ever uncertain what alluſion S. John conceived in his thoughts. For he conceived more by the boundleſſe power of the divine inſpiration, then we can poſſibly reach unto: and there was never place of Scripture ſo, ſince the Apoſtles dayes, expounded, (if before) that I dare ſay, The Spirit aimed at nothing elſe, and all is known. All known good expoſitions may be ſaid to be of the Spirit, but the Spirit hath many depths which never yet were ſearched. Therefore our anchor-hold muſt be on the words; or elſe we ſhall flote in the wide vaſt ſea of imagination and phanſie, without ſail, oar, or rudder, without card or compaſſe; by having recourſe to the *Non entes*, or *Non extantes alluſiones, Unextant alluſions*, which were in the thoughts of our bleſſed Apoſtle. It is no rule or canon which is not extant. *Non Ens* is an ill guide to *Ens.*

Beſides, the Syriack now much differeth from that in the Apoſtles dayes: how then can we finde out, what the Apoſtle conceived? For the Syriack and Arabick now in uſe (except perhaps the Goſpel of S. Matthew, and the Epiſtle to the Hebrews) were tranſlated out of the Greek, and not the Greek out of theſe. Had we exactly the identicall *αὐτόχειρα, firſt originall manuſcripts*, in which S. Matthew wrote his Goſpel, and S. Paul his Epiſtle to the Hebrews, in the Hebrew or Syriack; had we the true ſelf-ſame paper or parchment, in which the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles or their *amanuenſes* wrote the divine dictates; we might better gueſſe at their thoughts and the alluſions to which they bended themſelves. But now

Heinſius would have us to ſhoot at rovers; or rather to no ſteadie mark at all, at the then thoughts of our Apoſtle.

Laſtly, the worthy Heinſius doth a little interfere, when he counſelleth us to go to the alluſions which were in the thoughts of the Apoſtles, and not to the alluſions which are extant: For ſuppoſe I grant that he hath found whatſoever the Apoſtle alluded to in his minde; is not this now extant? Or can a thing be found which is not extant?

The third concluſion trenching upon Heinſius is this,

They had no libertie left unto them to put in their own conceits, or in writing to adde or blot out what they had done.

This point concerneth the matter which is written.

Peter Moulin in his third Epiſtle to Biſhop Andrews, as it is in the 182 page of the ſaid Biſhops *Opuſcula*, wrote thus; [a] *What things ſoever concern faith or ſalvation, they were determined by the Apoſtles under the guidance of divine inſpirations. In other things they often uſed their own diſcretion and prudence, as S. Paul intimateth,* 1. Cor. 7. 25. The grave and profound Oracle thus anſwereth him, pag. 193. [b] *I pray you ſpeak more ſparingly of this point,* viz. *That the Apoſtles uſed their own wiſdome or prudence: for it is dangerous to ſay or write, that the Apoſtles were in ſome things inſpired from heaven; in the reſt often uſed their own counſel and prudence, and that in matters which are found written in the Scripture. But you know it is concluded immediately after theſe words,* A CCORDING TO MY OPINION, *or judgement;* AND I THINK ALSO THAT I HAVE THE SPIRIT OF GOD, 1. *Cor.* 7. 40. *So that his very opinion or judgement, had its dictate from the Spirit of God.* Again, *If the place cited were not inſpired, but written in humane prudence; we muſt note it as Apocryphal. Then let us make an expurgatorie index of the New Teſtament. For we muſt ſeparate that which is precious from that which is vile. Things of humane wiſdome will never ſtand mixed with things divinely inſpired.* So farre he. Enough indeed for an Epiſtle; but I could have wiſhed that the moſt learned walking-librarie had more fully anſwered all the objections which do moſt forcibly arietate the truth; eſpecially ſuch as are couched in the ſame chapter, which is cited by Peter Moulin. If I come upon the ſtage after Roſcius, I look not for praiſe, but pardon. Let us muſter up all their forces together: and ſince that famous Biſhop hath withſtood the utmoſt of their ſtrength in the firſt brunt; the reſt will (like the French furie in warre) be the eaſier anſwered.

The firſt objection is, 1. Cor. 7. 6. *I ſpeak this by permiſſion, and not of commandment.*

The ſecond objection is, verſ. 10. *Unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord:* as if he had ſaid, A common man may ſpeak, and both deceive, and be deceived; but I ſay theſe things being taught of God. The

[a] *Quæ ad ſalutem & fidem pertinent, ab Apoſtolis ſtatuta ſunt afflatu divino; in cæteris, ſæpe uſi ſunt ſuâ prudentiâ, ut innuit Paulus.*

[b] *Parciùs iſta, de Apoſtolis,* prudentiâ ſuâ uſis: *periculoſe enim vel dicitur, vel ſcribitur, Apoſtolos in quibuſdam afflatu divino, in reliquis ſuâ prudentiâ ſæpe uſos; idq; in iis quæ ſcripta reperiuntur. Atqui vel illum ipſum locum, ubi καὶ τῶν ἐμὸν γνώμην, cis ità concludi, δοκῶ δὲ κἀγὼ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἔχειν· ità ut vel illius γνώμη, à Spiritu Dei dictamen ſuum habuerit.*

The third objection is, verſ. 12. *To the reſt ſpeak I, not the Lord.*

The fourth objection, verſ. 25. *Concerning virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord; yet I give my judgement, as one that hath obtained mercie of the Lord to be faithfull.*

The fifth objection, verſ. 40. *She is happier, if ſhe ſo abide, after my judgement: and I think alſo that I have the Spirit of God.*

To the firſt I thus anſwer, The Apoſtle meaneth not, that he was permitted onely to write or ſpeak ſome things, and commanded to write other things: nor touched it any part of his thought, to permit a little ſinne, that a greater might be avoided, as ſome hence maintain; [c] *Whileſt he forgiveth them, he granteth they were faultie*, ſaith Auguſtine concerning theſe words, *in lib. de peccat. Orig. cap.* 38. Again, *de bono Conjugali, cap.* 10. [d] *It is moſt abſurd to ſay, They ſinned not whom pardon abſolveth.* Again, *in Enchir. cap.* 78. [e] *Who can denie there is a fault, where the Apoſtle confeſſeth that the doers thereof were forgiven?* I anſwer, Eraſmus ſaith, ſome Copies have it κατὰ γνώμην, and not κατὰ συγγνώμην, *ſecundum indulgentiam*, as Auguſtine and others reade: and then the ſenſe is, *I tell you my opinion*, or *This is my advice; I leave you to your ſelves, I do not command it; God maketh not it a matter of precept, but thus I adviſe or counſel:* and then it foundeth all one with that in the 25. verſe, where the Apoſtle ſaith, γνώμην δὲ δίδωμι, *ſententiam do*; and verſe 40. κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην. [f] *Leaving every man to his own libertie in this point*, ſaith Eraſmus.

Secondly, I wonder that that holy Father could think S. Paul would permit the leaſt ſinne, when Rom. 3. 8. he counteth them ſlanderous reporters that affirmed he ſaid, *Let us do evil that good may come*; adding, *their damnation was juſt.*

Again, if it be read κατὰ συγγνώμην, our Engliſh well tranſlateth it, *By permiſſion:* and the Arabick expounds it by κατὰ συγχώρησιν, *By my conceſsion:* [g] *Nor ſpeak I it as a finall ſentence or binding deciſion*, as Beza hath it. The Arabick of Junius hath it, κατὰ συμβουλήν, *With mutuall conſent:* and thus enlargeth it; [h] *Whereas I ſay, One may depart from another by conſent for a time, that they may faſt the more, and pray the better; I command not this, but adviſe it. For even God himſelf never gave charge unto any of his, that this ſhould be done commonly, and kept perpetually: but he hath given us an example agreeable to my counſel, that it may be done ſometimes for a while upon extraordinary occaſion.* Exod. 19. 15. *Come not at your wives.* The tranſlated words of the Arabick by Junius are theſe, [i] *This is the advice, not the decree of the Law.* Beza makes the ſenſe of the words to be, as if S. Paul did not command expreſſely, that all ſhould be married, as ſome might collect from his words, verſ. 2. Junius

[c] *Dum tribuit veniam, denotat culpam.*

[d] *Quis ambigat, abſurdiſſimè dici, non eos peccaſſe, quibus venia datur?*

[e] *Quis eſſe peccatum neget, cùm dari veniam facientibus Apoſtolica authoritas fateatur?*

[f] *Liberum interim faciens hac in re ſuum cuique judicium.*

[g] *Non dico ut in decreto deciſivo.*

[h] *Quod dico ex conſenſu poſſe alterum ab altero diſcedere ad tempus propter jejunium & orationem, non jubeo ſed conſulo. Nam nè Deus quidem ipſe hoc ordinarium aut perpetuum eſſe mandavit ſuis, ſed exemplum præbuit cum hoc conſilio meo ἀνάλογον, &c.*

[i] *Dico hoc, juris (ut dici ſolet) conſilium, non ut mandatum.*

applieth them to his leaving it indifferent for man and wife to forſake the companie of each other for a time. [i] *Auguſtines* PARDON *is farre fetcht and forced too much*, ſaith Beza: for συγγνώμη is a candid interpretation upon good reaſon, and doth not alwaies imply ſuch a pardon as connoteth a fault. Ariſtotle ſaith, [k] *It is an upright ſentence, inclining not to rigour, but to moderation.* Peter Martyr ſaith, [l] *It is exerciſed about that which is equall, and qualifieth the rigour of the law, which otherwiſe is extream injurie. —Even in the ſame ſort could I deal with one whom I ſaw to faſt, or to ſtudie too much; that he might ſometime refreſh himſelf. Which I would not ſay imperiouſly, but by way of counſel grounded on equitie. Neither doth it therefore follow, that to ſtudie hard, or to faſt holily is a ſinne.* So farre Peter Martyr; who might as well have inſiſted in S. Pauls advice to his ſcholar, 1. Tim. 5.23. *Drink no longer water, but uſe a little wine for thy ſtomacks ſake, and thine often infirmities.* The Syriack in Junius hath it anſwerable to the Arabick; [m] *This I ſay, as to the weak, not by commandment.* [n] *By grant, not precept,* as Tremellius turneth it. [o] *I charge not, but permit,* ſaith Haymo: for how could S. Paul command when Chriſt left it free? When Chriſt ſaid, *It is not given to all:* or, *He that is able to receive it, let him receive it,* Matth. 19.12. if the words have reference to the ſecond verſe: or, when God himſelf left it indifferent, if it hath dependance upon the temporarie abſtemiouſneſſe, upon juſt occaſion touched at in the fifth verſe?

Concerning the ſecond objection, verſ. 10. *Unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord.* I anſwer, Firſt, that thoſe forms of ſpeech are not ſimply *excluſive*, much leſſe *contradictorie*; and denote not ſo much a ſimple *negation* as a kinde of *compariſon* ſometime: *I, yet not I.* And we have other places of Scripture to be ranked in the ſame parallell: John 7. 16. *My doctrine is not mine, but his that ſent me.* As therefore it was moſt true, that Chriſts doctrine, even as he is God and Man, is not his in one ſenſe, that is, *originally*; (for as he had not the divine eſſence of himſelf, or from himſelf, but from God the Father; ſo from the Father had he the divine doctrine) and yet in another ſenſe is truely Chriſts doctrine; as conceived and preached by him who is God, the Fountain of truth, yea Truth it ſelf. And as the doctrine which he had as he was Man, was partly not his, (for the infuſed doctrine into the ſoul of Chriſt, comprehending all ſcientificall habits, by which Chriſt naturally knew, and that moſt perfectly, whatſoever was to be known, was not his as Man, but was infuſed of God) and partly his, namely ſuch as he, like a Viator or another Man, experimentally might gather. And the true meaning of the words may be, *The doctrine which I preach is not the invention of mine own brain, but his rather who*

[i] *Nomen* VENIÆ *perperam torquetur ab Auguſtino.*

[k] Ἡ συγγνώμη, γνώμη ἐστὶ κριτικὴ τὸ ἐπιεικὲς ὁρθοῦσα. Eth. l. 6. c. 11

[l] *Verſatur circa æquũ, & ſummum jus remittit, quod alioquin eſt ſumma injuria.*

[m] *Hoc dico ego, tanquã infirmis, non ex mandato.*

[n] *Ex conceſſione, non ex imperio.*

[o] *Non præcipio, ſed permitto.*

who ſent me, to teach you what he taught me: and ſo is both mine, and not mine: To which effect Pererius. So in the place of the Apoſtle where it is written, *I command, yet not I, but the Lord*; ſince S. Paul might be conſidered either as an ordinarie man, or as an Apoſtle inſpired from God: he firſt ſaith, *I command*; and then by diſtinguiſhing explaineth his meaning, *Yet not I*, as a common man, *but* rather *the Lord*, by me his Apoſtle. And all this proveth not that S. Paul could write any thing as he was an Apoſtle, of his own head; or yet put in any of his own conceits: but was wholly guided by the Spirit. For, whatſoever is ſo properly mans work, that it is not alſo Gods, that is not good; ſince the Authour of goodneſſe is excluded.

Secondly I anſwer, The place doth rather expreſſely ſay, that whatſoever S. Paul wrote or ſpake as an Apoſtle, they were not his words or writings, but the words of God (for his commands were not his, but the Lords) then any way imply that he could write any thing as an Apoſtle, without the Spirit, or by the dictate of his own naturall prudence onely.

Thirdly, ° *I command not according to mine opinion, but the Lord in the Goſpel doth, That a man may not depart from his wife except for fornication,* ſaith Haymo. Where our Saviour ſpeaks not of a ſhort departure with conſent, for the improvement of religious duties (for then S. Paul might have had a command for it in the objection precedent:) but our Saviour ſpeaketh of a totall or finall departure of man and wife by bill of divorcement or ſeparation: for of this Chriſt ſpake expreſſely, Mat. 19.9. Mark 10.11. Luk. 16.18. Therefore S. Paul commanded not, but the Lord; namely Chriſt in thoſe places of the Goſpel to which he aimed.

° *Præcipio non ego ex mea ſententia, ſed Dominus in Evangelio, &c.*

The third objection is out of the 1. Cor. 7. 12. *To the reſt ſpeak I, not the Lord.* Theſe words compared with the former may ſeem to carrie it cleare againſt me. For what can be of more force? *I command, yet not I, but the Lord*; and, *To the reſt ſpeak I, not the Lord:* as if S. Paul ſpake and wrote ſomething by humane wiſdome, which the Lord bid him not. Firſt, I anſwer with Peter Martyr, S. Paul ſaith thus, becauſe before he had reference to Chriſts ſpeech in the Goſpel, of not eaſily diſſolving matrimonie: but now he ſets down ſomewhat, of which Chriſt in the Goſpel is not found to have ſaid any thing. So now *he* ſpeaks, not *the Lord:* namely, not *Chriſt in the Goſpel*, not *Chriſt by word of mouth as he was man:* and yet on the contrarie ſide, we may as truely ſay even in this place, and to S. Pauls proper ſenſe, with the words inverted, *The Lord ſpeaks, not I:* Not I, of my ſelf; not I, as a man: but God from heaven, or the holy Spirit ſpeaketh.

The concluſion is, S. Paul ſpeaketh or writeth nothing as an Apoſtle from himſelf, without the Lord, without divine immediate revelation from the holy Ghoſt: but he might relate ſomething which Chriſt ſpake not whileſt Chriſt lived on earth; ſomething that is not regiſtred in the Goſpel: And thus S. Paul did ſpeak, and not the Lord: And thus may an other ſpeak or write, and not the Lord. [p] *I ſpeak, not the Lord: Did not the Lord ſpeak by him? Yes. But therefore he ſaid that himſelf ſpake and not the Lord, becauſe this precept is not contained in any of the Goſpels, as the other was*, ſaith Haymo before Peter Martyr. And indeed, I remember not that Chriſt ſo much as toucheth at this point; Whether a beleeving man ſhould put away, or dwell from an unbeleeving woman, yea or no?

To the fourth objection, 1. Cor. 7. 25. *I have no commandment from the Lord, yet I give my judgement*, I anſwer, It was matter of *counſel*, not of *precept*; it was left indifferent; the doing, or not doing had not been ſinne. [q] *Chriſt would give no command concerning ſingle life or virginitie, leſt he ſhould ſeem to condemn marriage.* So Auguſtine, *in libello de ſanct. virginit.* So Hierom againſt Jovinian: So Ambroſe, ſaith Peter Martyr. Yet the *Conſilium do, I counſel*, is the advice of ſuch an one, as *had obtained mercie of the Lord to be faithfull*: and a faithfull ſteward will not diſtribute more or leſſe then his Lord appointeth.

The unjuſt ſteward made them write leſſe then was due: the uſurer makes them write more: the good and faithfull man followeth his maſters will κατὰ πόδα, *foot by foot*. So this place proveth not that the Apoſtle as an Apoſtle wrote or ſpake by humane wiſdome any thing, but what was appointed of God.

The Rhemiſts on verſe 12 ſay, *By this we learn, that there were many matters over and above the things that Chriſt taught or preſcribed, left to the Apoſtles order and interpretation: wherein they might, as the caſe required, either command or counſel; and we bound to obey accordingly.* Doctour Eſtius goeth further: [r] *This ſpeech,* I COMMAND, YET NOT I, BUT THE LORD, *doth ſufficiently evidence, that the Apoſtles and their ſucceſſours can command ſomething which Chriſt himſelf by himſelf commanded not.* Both of them runne awry in one extream. Doctour Fulk anſwereth to that place of the Rhemiſts, *The Apoſtles had not particular precepts for every caſe; but they had generall rules in Chriſts doctrine, which they were bound to follow in their precepts and counſels.* I think he approacheth too nigh unto them; unleſſe he mean that both their precepts and counſels had the divine dictate to guide them; eſpecially in things which they wrote. And whereas he ſaith, *They had not particular precepts for*

p *Ego dico, non Dominus: Nunquid Dominus non loquebatur per eum? Utique. Sed ideo dixit ſe dicere, & non Dominum; quia hoc præceptum non continetur in Evangelio dictũ à Domino ſicut illud ſuperius.*

q *Noluit Deus de virginitate & cœlibatu præcipere, quia viſus fuiſſet damnare nuptias*

r *Satis autem inſinuat hic ſermo*, Præcipio non ego, ſed Dominus, *Apoſtolos & eorum ſucceſſores poſſe quædã præcipere quæ Chriſtus ipſe per ſe non præcepit.*

for every case, I say, they had for all cases necessarie: especially concerning the whole Church. And their generall rules might rather be for guiding matters of *order* and *discipline*, then of *doctrine*. For he that promised to lead them into all truth, would not leave them in the framing of particulars; as he doth us and other men, who out of generals do deduce these and these specials. For there is a great distance and traverse to be placed between those sacred Penmen, and other succeeding Expositours of holy Writ. And S. Paul doth imply, that even his judgement or counsel was according to the Spirit of God; as Bishop Andrews well observed, and now cometh to be handled.

The fifth objection is verse 40: in the same verse where he saith, Κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην, *According to my judgement*, he addeth, Δοκῶ δὲ κἀγὼ πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἔχειν, *I think also that I have the Spirit of God.* *Minus dicit, plus volens intelligi, He speaketh sparingly, but would be understood more largely*, say I. So verse 26, *I suppose*: and 1. Cor. 4. 9. *I think that God hath set forth us the Apostles last.* [f] I THINK. *He speaketh soberly, signifying more then he spake; and it is all one as if he had said*, I KNOW CERTAINLY, saith Dionysius Carthus. with whom accordeth Primasius, *Do not think that I speak what I do of my self; the Spirit of God speaketh in me:* [t] *The word* I THINK *is not wrapped about with doubtfulnesse.* Peter Martyr thinks it is an Ironie against the false Apostles, who traduced S. Paul as unworthy to be an Apostle. And then the Ironie hath as full force, as if he had peremptorily avouched, *The Spirit of the Lord is in me, and by it I write what I write.*

f Puto autem. *Sobriè loquitur, minúsque dicit & majus significat; ut sit sensus*, Certò scio.

t Puto *non dubietatem significat.*

Other objections may be made, as the 2. Cor. 11. 17. *I speak it not after the Lord, but as it were foolishly in this confidence of boasting.* Therefore not onely humane wisdome, but humane infirmitie may seem to challenge part both in his words and writings. It is answered in a few words of Dionysius Carthusianus, *Non loquor, id est, Loqui non videor:* that is, *It seems not so to some, though my self know the contrarie.*

Others may object, 1. Cor. 9. 8. *Say I these things as a man? or saith not the Law the same also?* I answer, that he might speak or write some things like an other man, some things unexpressed in their Law; but now he speaketh or writeth (for they are both one sense in this notion) as an Apostle; who therefore was equally to be regarded (as a Penman of the *Law of Grace*) with Moses, a Penman of the *Law Leviticall.*

It may yet be objected what S. John saith, 2. Epist. vers. 12. *Having many things to write unto you, I would not write with paper and ink:* and 3. Epist. John ver. 13. *I had many things to write, but I will not with ink and pen write unto thee.* From whence a power seemeth to be wholly left in him, both whether he

would write or no, and what he would write. I anſwer to both places; If he had ſaid he had writ any thing without or beyond the Spirit, or what he was bid not to write; he had ſpoken home to the purpoſe: but theſe words do not imply that he had either power or will to write any thing of his own head, or by the wiſdome or learning of man; but they fully evidence, that the holy Ghoſt had ſuggeſted many things unto him, which the ſame bleſſed Spirit would not have him to write; as being fitter perhaps to be delivered face to face, and not concerning poſteritie.

If I knew any more oppoſite arguments, I would endeavour their anſwer. The poſitive proofs I referre to the laſt point of all; it being the very main hinge of the controverſie. Onely conſider this one thing, *The Scripture hath a priviledge above all other writings.* Aquinas on 2.Timoth.3.15. giveth this reaſon, " *Becauſe other writings ſavour of humane reaſon; but the Scripture is divine:* Where he excludeth the prudence of man from compoſing any Scripture. If any earthly wiſdome wrote any part of it, it is no more to be accounted our Scripture. Let this ſuffice for the third concluſion, concerning the matter of Scripture: wherein the holy Penmen had no libertie left them to put in their own conceits; or in writing to adde or blot out what they had done: whereby all humane literature and wiſdome is removed from ſharing part in the holy Writ.

" *Quia aliæ traditæ ſunt per rationem humanam; ſacra autem Scriptura eſt divina.*

The fourth concluſion followeth, concerning the manner of writing: *viz.* They had no libertie to clothe their inward apprehenſions with words of their own. Either all the Penmen had the libertie, or none: (The disjunction ſtands upon a *Da tertium, Give me a reaſon why ſome ſhould, and not others.* Who were theſe ſome? and why thoſe?) But all had not libertie: (for the very words were dictated unto ſome of them) *Ergò* &c.

Either every Penman did apparrell his underſtanding with words of his own throughout all and every of his own writings, or it was practiſed in ſome places onely. If ſo, then again I enquire what places they were; and why thoſe had an eſpeciall priviledge above others.

S. John indeed was bid to *write the things which he had ſeen, and the things which are, and the things which ſhall be hereafter,* Revel. 1. 19. I anſwer, This generall command evinceth not, that the holy Ghoſt did not adminiſter as well the words as the matter.

If it be objected, that the Evangelicall Prophet Iſaiah, and the Pſalmograph, and ſome others, are moſt eloquent in the Old; and in the New Teſtament, the beloved diſciple S. John is compared to an Eagle for his loftie flight; and S. Paul may ſeem to have brought ſome of the third heaven down with him,

him; ſo heavenly is he: but Amos, and ſome others writ more plainly, in an homely ſtyle. I anſwer, If all this were true; yet it proveth not that any of them were left to expreſſe as they would their own dreams, viſions, or illuminations; neither did they frame and fit their ſtyles to the Spirit, or their words to the matter; nor indeed could they. For what proportion is there between *finite* and *infinite?* and how can the ſhallow capacitie of *man* comprehend the depth of *God?* God forbad the linſie-woolſie; and to the *divine truths* would he ſuffer them to adapt *humane expreſsions?* How often in the Old Teſtament, is both the matter put into their hearts, and the manner with the words into their mouthes? And is the Law of Grace of leſſe worth then the Law of Moſes? God forbid. But whoſoever readeth the Prophet Amos, and the reſt that are undervalued, ſhall finde more in Amos, then Amos; more in him then in one *among the herd-men of Tekoa*, Amos 1.1. and ſhall heare the piercing language of the Spirit in others: ſometimes perhaps attempering it ſelf to the partie writing, and making both words and matter eaſie; but at other times it rapteth him above himſelf, and maketh him (as it were) to prink it in loftie and almoſt undiſcernable towring; by infuſing things, phraſing ſentences, and dictating words above what was agreeable to the meanneſſe of his former calling.

That the holy Ghoſt can and hath ſuggeſted the very words very often, I think none will denie. That ever he permitted them a libertie of many ſentences, of many phraſes, of many variations of words, to chooſe what they liked, and to refuſe the reſt; I think few ancient Divines ever ſaid before, but to that effect ſaith Heinſius. Els what can his meaning be, when he ſaith, S. John ſaw the Chaldee Paraphraſe, and Helleniſts, and had often reference to them; and that divers things were taken from the Targummim? [x] *The Evangeliſt alwayes hath an eye to the Targumiſts*, ſaith he, pag. 550. If the noble Heinſius had ſaid in any one place (which he did not, ſo farre as my remembrance now beareth) that the holy Spirit had guided S. John to thoſe Authours and authorities of the Targumiſts, Helleniſts, and Chaldee Paraphraſt; I ſhould have ſubſcribed, and ſat down at his feet. But when he ſo often appealeth from the Greek to the Syriack, and ſaith, S. John was ſo converſant with the forenamed Authours; he derogateth (in mine opinion) from the majeſtie of the holy Writ; whileſt he would ſeem to have ought of it taken from humane reading or wiſdome, though of an Apoſtle; unleſſe it were added, That the holy Spirit guided the Apoſtle unto it, and did dictate it unto him, not as it was known before to the Apoſtle, but as the holy Ghoſt thought fit to make uſe of it, and to ſanctifie that part of humane literature: to dictate, I ſay,

[x] *Ad Targumiſtas ſemper reſpicit Evangeliſta.*

ſay, the words and ſyllables, yea every letter and iota; and in the writing to guide their hands aright; as a good maſter of writing over-ſpreadeth and over-ruleth the hand of his ſcholar, and writeth what copie he pleaſeth, without reference or regard to the ſcholars former knowledge, but rather to his future inſtruction.

This is that which againſt Heinſius may be averred, That though many things which are in S. John and other holy Penmen, were before in the Targum, Talmud, Helleniſts, Chaldee Paraphraſe, or any heathen Authours; yet it doth not neceſſarily evince, that the holy Actuaries or Notaries did overſee, reade, heare, or tranſcribe thoſe things out of their knowledge from the ſaid Authours: but both the names of thoſe Authours, and the things themſelves were preſented to them by that bleſſed Spirit which knew all things; and this among the reſt, That theſe words, phraſes, and ſentences, were fit to be inſerted into the holy Writ, which now are in it.

All Scripture is of divine inſpiration: But the very words are part of Scripture: Therefore even they were inſpired.

Revel. 19. 9. The Angel ſaid, *Write, Bleſſed are they which are called unto the marriage-ſupper of the Lambe.* Did not the Angel ſpeak the words? Did not he give the Apoſtle both matter and words?

When the Apoſtle was commanded, Revel. 14. 13. by a voice from heaven, to write, *Bleſſed are the dead which die in the Lord, &c.* was he commanded to write his conceits and thoughts apprehended in Syriack, and tranſlate them into Helleniſticall Greek? or did the heavenly voice ſuggeſt onely an holy inſpiration into him, and left him to coyn words, as Heinſius would have it? or rather did not the voice teach the very words which ſhould be written, viz. *Bleſſed are the dead, &c.?* Now let us paſſe to the fifth and laſt Concluſion, in which we muſt diſſent from the worthy Heinſius, and diſarm him of his often-inculcated, but not once proved Tenet,

The Ἀγιόγραφοι, or *Writers of holy Scripture, conceived in one language, and writ in an other.* Upon which ground he hath raiſed a ſtrange ſtructure: but his very ground-work is ſandie, ſlipperie, and falſe: And this I hope to evince by Scripture, Authoritie, and Reaſon. All which ſhall be ſquared to that Corner-ſtone, which more then once before I hewed upon more roughly, and now (by Gods grace) intend to poliſh; namely, That the very words and letters were dictated unto the holy Scribes: and therefore they had no power to change or tranſchange, to adde or diminiſh; or to expreſſe by their own words their internall irradiation: but in the language

which

which they conceived, they alſo wrote their heavenly dictates.

2. Pet. 1.21. *The Propheſie came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God ſpake as they were moved by the holy Ghoſt.* Therefore their very ſpeech being according to the motion of the holy Ghoſt, their words were not of their own choice, but from above; and not onely divine thoughts, but ſacred words were alſo given them.

1. Cor. 2.13. S. Paul ſpake *in words which the holy Ghoſt taught.* Did the holy Ghoſt inſpire thoughts into them in one language, and teach them words to ſpeak in an other language? *Cui bono? To what end and purpoſe?* and why not all done in the language which they conceived?

2. Tim. 3.16. *Scriptura per Spiritum ſcripta eſt, The Scripture was writ by the Spirit,* ſaith the Syriack; not onely *inſpired,* as it is from the Greek, but *written;* and as it was inſpired, written.

Revel. 19.9. The Angel ſaith concerning very words which he commanded to be wrote, *Theſe are the true ſayings of God.* Not *inſpirations* onely of *God,* and the *words* of *Men;* but *the ſayings of God.*

Exod. 34.27. *Write thou theſe words: for after the tenour of theſe words I have made a covenant.* God was not tied to the words, Moſes was to the writing of the very words.

Jerem. 30.2. *Write thee all the words which I have ſpoken unto thee in a book.* He gave him no power to put in words of his own.

Twelve times in the Revelation was S. John commanded *to write:* and knew he not *the words?*

Hoſ. 8.12. *I have written to Ephraim the great things of my Law;* Even all what my Prophets have done, I challenge as mine own writing.

Authorities of men.

The Scriptures were written [y] *in obedience to the Spirit,* ſaith Sasbout on Peter: Therefore the Apoſtles had not the power left unto them of writing their own conceits, but were fitted with words by the Spirit.

[z] *If the Prophets and other writers of holy Scripture ſpake by the moving and inſpiration of the holy Ghoſt; it followeth, that all the Scripture is the word of God; no otherwiſe to be eſteemed of by us, then if God immediately without the miniſtery of men or Angels had ſet it forth, and, as I may ſay, had written it with his own finger,* ſaith the learned Eſtius.

Even Cornelius Cornelii à Lapide himſelf, on Timothie thus, [a] *The Prophets and other holy Penmen of Scripture are ſtyled the pens and inſtruments of the holy Ghoſt, as of that ſcribe who ſpeedily writeth, inſpireth, and dictateth the divine writ.* Where he

[y] *Magiſterio Spiritus.*

[z] *Si Spiritu ſancto inſpirati, & ab eo impulſi, locuti ſunt Propheta, & cæteri librorum ſacrorum ſcriptores, Conſequens eſt, Scripturam totam eſſe verbum Dei; non aliter à nobis accipiendam, quàm ſi Deus immediatè & abſque humano vel Angelico miniſterio eam edidiſſet, &, ut ità dicam, digito ſuo ſcripſiſſet.*

[a] *Prophetæ, & alii ſcriptores ἀμάγγεοι, vocantur calami & inſtrumenta Spiritus ſancti, quaſi ſcribæ velociter ſcribentis, inſpirantis, & dictantis ſacras literas.*

he confeſſeth the holy Spirit not to inſpire onely, but to dictate; yea, to write like a ſwift ſcribe the holy Scripture.

Gregorius, *Præfat. in Job cap.2.* [b] *The writers of the heavenly word, becauſe they are filled with the holy Ghoſt, are elevated above themſelves in him; and, as it were, out of themſelves: and ſo the ſentences of God are uttered, as it were, by their lips.*

Athanaſius, *Epiſt. ad Lib.* ſaith, [c] *Chriſt made the Old and New Teſtament.*

[d] *What is the mouth of the Lord, but the Scriptures, by which the Lord ſpeaketh?* ſaith Rupert on Matth. *lib.*4.

Philo Judæus, *in lib. Quis rerum divinarum hæres?* thus, [e] *A Prophet propheſieth nothing out of his own brain; but all things by the prompting of the holy Ghoſt:* as he wittily concludeth. Therefore not ſo much as the words are his own.

Chryſoſtom, *de Lazaro, Homil.*4. *Though a dead man revive, and an Angel come from heaven, you muſt beleeve Scriptures above all: for the Maſter of Angels, the Lord of the living and the dead, he himſelf framed them.* The ſame Chryſoſtom, *de expulſione ipſius*, ſheweth the manner. *I reade his own handwriting, &c.* They are done by his hand; the very writing it ſelf is his: and therefore called *Chyrographum Dei, A writing under Gods own hand*, by Auguſtine, on Pſal. 144.

Now follow the Reaſons why they conceived and writ in the ſame tongue.

Firſt, there is little or no difference between the Apoſtles and other men, if the Apoſtles did frame words to their heavenly inſpirations. For when it pleaſeth the bleſſed Spirit, who bloweth where he liſteth, to drop down into the ſoul of an ordinary man ſome thoughts divine, and in the language of ſpirits ſaith unto the ſame ſoul, Of theſe ſee that you make a prayer; the righteous man accordingly obeyeth, and of thoſe inward apprehenſions ſhapeth a verbal prayer, and poureth it forth before God Almightie, and ſetteth it down in writing: Shall the prayer be held as Divine as Scriptures? Then may Manaſſes his Apocryphall prayer, immediately before the books of Maccabees (as it is in our laſt tranſlation) be no longer Apocryphall, but Divine; as Divine as any prayer made by the ſelected holy Penmen. To have a thing perfectly Divine, is required that heavenly words may be mixed with heavenly illumination.

Secondly, our faith will be queſtioned, if thoughts were inſpired, and the Penmen ſhould adde what words they pleaſed. [f] *Our faith will ſtumble, if the authoritie of the Scripture be ſhaken never ſo little*, ſaith Auguſtine, *de doctr. Chriſtian.* 1. 37. But the Scriptures authoritie ſhaketh, if God give onely the matter, and men the words.

Thirdly, the Prophets and Apoſtles wrote not alwayes all their

[b] *Scriptores ſacri Eloquii, quia repleti Spiritu ſancto, ſuper ſe trahuntur, quaſi extra ſemetipſos fiunt; & ſic Dei ſententias, quaſi de labiis, proferunt.*

[c] *Chriſtus vetus & novum Teſtamentum compoſuit.*

[d] *Quid eſt illud os Domini, niſi Scriptura, per quas loquitur Dominus?*

[e] *Propheta nihil ex ſe proloquitur; ſed omnia, ſubmonente alio.*

[f] *Titubabit fides, ſi Scripturarum vacillat authoritas.*

their own things themſelves; but ſometimes uſed the miniſterie of divers others. A Scribe and a Prophet were two diſtinct perſons and offices, Jer. 36.26.

Jeremie had Baruch: Jer. 36.4. *Baruch wrote from the mouth of Jeremiah all the words of the Lord:* ſo then the words of Jeremiah to Baruch, were the words of the Lord to Jeremiah. And when that roll was burnt, Jeremiah by the word of the Lord, was bid *to take another roll, and write in it*, verſ. 28, &c. Which Jeremie did, not by himſelf, but by *Baruch the ſcribe*, verſ. 32.

The nine firſt chapters of the Proverbs of Solomon were written by Solomon himſelf. The reſt were writ by others, who attended on Solomon and heard them: and are like ſo many precious ſtones apart, and ſeverally; though not made up into one jewell or chain, nor hanging together in any ſetled method; yet to be eſteemed at as high a rate and value as the very writings of Solomon. The ſame Spirit inſpired all, the ſame mouth ſpake all, though they were penned by ſeverall hands, by the command of the ſame holy Spirit.

In the New Teſtament S. Paul wrote much *with his own hand*; The whole Epiſtle to the Galatians, Gal. 6.11. (at leaſt to theſe very words:) and to Philemon, verſ. 19.

Many ſalutations: 2. Theſſal. 3. 17, 18. *The ſalutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is the token in every Epiſtle: ſo I write, The grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt be with you all. Amen.* So that we may ſoundly gather, that whatſoever Epiſtle under his name hath not that in it, it was not written by him. There was an Epiſtle written in his name to the Theſſalonians, terrifying them as if the generall judgement had been preſent: as may be gathered, 2. Theſſ. 2.2. But S. Paul diſclaims it. It had not (belike) the ſalutation with his own hand, his friendly farewell and prayer, which (ſaith Anſelm) was in theſe or the like words, *Grace, &c.* as all the reſt of his Epiſtles have toward their end, though with a little variation of words; ſometimes larger, ſometimes briefer: even the Epiſtle to the Hebrews alſo, Hebr. 13. 25. *Grace be with you all. Amen.* That you may not queſtion, but alſo that is his Epiſtle: whereas no other Apoſtles have it ſo fully; though S. Peter cometh neareſt him, 1. Pet. 5.14.

For all this, he uſed the help of ſome others in writing. *All the ſecond Epiſtle to the Theſſalonians was written with another hand, except the ſalutation at the end,* ſaith Eſtius. Rom. 16.22. *I Tertius, who wrote this Epiſtle, ſalute you in the Lord.* The words will bear this ſenſe, *I Tertius, who wrote this Epiſtle in the Lord, ſalute you:* or thus, (as the Vulgat hath it) *I Tertius ſalute you, who wrote this Epiſtle in the Lord. He ſaid,* IN THE LORD, *to ſhew that he wrote not for money,* ſaith Cajetan.

Queſtionleſſe, Paul dictated, and Tertius wrote the Epiſtle, ſaith Eſtius. Even thoſe words themſelves are not Tertius his own; inſerted as a private mans or ſecretaries, but are divine Scripture. And either by the Spirit he was commanded to write ſo, and that thought was from heaven put into his heart, and thoſe words into his mouth, to be written by his hand: or elſe (which I take to be moſt likely) S. Paul knowing the minde of Tertius, perhaps in part by Tertius his own expreſſion, but rather and chiefeſt by Divine revelation, that Tertius did ſalute them in the Lord; he willed him ſo to write.

I hope Heinſius will not ſay, that Tertius conceived in Syriack, and wrote in Greek: or, when S. Paul made his narrative in the Hebrew tongue, Act. 22.2. that Luke conceived in Syriack, and wrote in Greek: neither can he ſay the like of the holy ſecretaries, to whom not firſt thoughts in language ſpirituall, and then words; but thoughts by words outward and expreſſed were revealed. Yet Eraſmus in his laſt Annotation on the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, ſaith thus, [g] *What ſome do affirm,* THAT S. PAUL HIMSELF VVROTE IN HEBREVV, BUT S. LUKE DID EXPRESSE IN HIS OVVN VVORDS THE ARGUMENT OF THE EPISTLE VVHICH HE HAD GOTTEN BY HEART, *let others conſider what force and power it hath.* What, will you ſay nothing to this? Not ſo great a Critick? Sure this drop might have fallen from your pen, That ſuch manner of writing had ſavoured no more of the Spirit, then any ordinary writing where a skilfull ſcribe doth amplifie the heads given unto him.

[g] *Quod affirmant hîc quidam,* Paulum ipsũ ſcripſiſſe Hebraicè, cæterùm Lucam argumentum Epiſtolæ, quam memoriâ tenebat, ſuis explicuiſſe verbis, *quantum valeat, viderint alii.*

Again, Eraſmus on Hebr. 2. in his Anſwer to Fabers 57 objection, relateth that Faber, [h] *Whatſoever ſeems incommodious or offenſive, layeth the fault thereof upon the Interpreters: but not prudently enough, as I think*, ſaith Eraſmus: and in the anſwer to the one and fourtieth objection, [i] *Faber ſcourgeth the Interpreter of this Epiſtle who did not turn the word ELOHIM, in the Pſalm, FROM GOD, when the Septuagint did ſo, to whom this might rather be imputed.* Again, Eraſmus ſaith, *ibid.* of Faber, [k] *He commenceth a ſuit againſt the Interpreter of this Epiſtle.* All this ſhews Fabers opinion to be, That ſome writers of Scripture had power to uſe ſuch words as they pleaſed: and uſed ſome amiſſe, even ſuch as he found fault withall. O novell criticiſm! Wilt thou ſet thy ſelf no bounds till thou reacheſt up to heaven, and trampleſt on the word of God? The holy *Amanuenſes* were guided by the Spirit to *write*, as well as the Apoſtles to *dictate*.

[h] *Quicquid eſt incommodi & offendiculi, id in Interpretem rejicit; ſed meo judicio parùm prudenter.*

[i] *Faber flagellat Interpretem hujus Epiſtolæ, qui in Pſalmo non verterit ELOHIM, A DEO, cùm idem fecerint Septuaginta, quibus magis conveniebat hoc imputari.*

[k] *In jus trahit Interpretem Epiſtolæ.*

When S. Paul accounted, and would have his Galatians to account it as a favour above ordinary, that he wrote ſo large an Epiſtle as that to the Galatians with his own hand; and ſince the Epiſtle to the Romanes was larger then it, and

was

was writ by Tertius; let me probably collect, that other Epiſtles of S. Paul, as thoſe to the Corinthians, and that to the Hebrews, and any other (if any other be longer and larger) were not written by S. Pauls own hand. For then his own writing had not been ſo great a teſtimonie and argument of his love to the Galatians: for the reſt were longer and larger; but were writ by ſome other hand, except perhaps the cloſe and ſalutation.

Fevardentius, on 1. Pet. 5. 12. and Salmeron, *Tom. 13. Diſput. 5.* (as they are cited by Lorinus, Act. 15. 23.) do think that Paul and the reſt of the Apoſtles wrote ſeldome with their own hands, but did dictate and ſubſcribe: which they prove by S. Peter, 1. Pet. 5. 12. *By Silvanus a faithfull brother unto you (as I ſuppoſe) I have written briefly.* Lorinus anſwereth, That by the ſame reaſon, Judas and Silas wrote the Epiſtle of the Councel at Hieruſalem, Act. 15. 23. Let me reply, That I ſee nothing to the contrary in the Text, or otherwhere, but Judas and Silas being *chief men among the brethren,* might write it as well as any others; and might alſo be joyned in Commiſſion with others, to carrie it.

Concerning which Penmen this is my opinion, *That even they were led by the holy Ghoſt, both to conceive what the Apoſtles ſpake, and to write exactly what they dictated: ſo that they did not, they could not erre in writing any one word, ſyllable, or letter of the firſt Originals; no nor did, nor could miſ-accent it, or miſ-point any part thereof: nor can it be proved, nor ſeems it likely that ever the Apoſtles reviſed, or righted what the Penmen had done; but ſubſcribed to it, took it as their own, or rather as the holy Ghoſts, and ſealed it for divine Scripture.* Oh that the firſt Originals themſelves of the New Teſtament, or of ſome part of it, could yet be found! I would go a thouſand miles on my bare feet to ſee them, kiſſe them, and in Tertullians phraſe, I would *adore the plenitude of them.* They would prove an Antidote againſt many hereſies, a correctorie of more falſe opinions which have ſprung up from the variation of Copies, and the uncertaintie what reading is beſt.

By this opinion, I am ſure, one firm anchor-hold is eſtabliſhed; That humane wiſdome and skill is excluded from having part in any parcell of Scripture: and the whole Scripture is by me maintained to be wholly and abſolutely true; certain, and moſt divine; which Heinſius and others ſeem not to do. So end I this point.

I Give thee thanks, moſt gracious God, that thou haſt freed me of the gout, and eaſed me of the ſtone: that I have been able, though in great weaknes, to ſwim through this ſea, to go through this wilderneſſe, in paths untrodden: Lord, I beſeech thee, by thine infinite mercies, be mercifull to my ſoul; prepare me throughly for my departure; and in the houre of death and judgement, good Chriſt deliver me. Amen. Amen.

CHAP. X.

1. *Reall truth in the Greek and Latine texts of* Act. 7. 16. *The place expounded thus*, The Fathers were not Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob; but the twelve ſonnes of Jacob.

2. *Theſe twelve Fathers were not buried in* Abrahemio, *but in* Sychem.

3. Abraham *in this place is not taken* properly, *but* patronymicé.

4. Τῶ Συχέμ, *uſed by S. Stephen, amphibolous, and expounded.*

5. *Two opinions concerning the place of* Acts 7. 16. *propounded.*

6. *The laſt preferred.*

I Now return to the old matter and Text, Act. 7. 16. Foure propoſitions there are in the words of S. Stephen, which are all queſtioned.

Firſt, that the Fathers are ſaid to be carried over into Sychem.

Secondly, that they were laid in the ſepulchre of Abraham.

Thirdly, that Abraham bought the ſepulchre of the ſonnes of Hemor.

Fourthly, that this Hemor was the father of Sychem, as our laſt Tranſlation hath it very truely.

Now let us ſee what different or contrary propoſitions are maintained againſt theſe; and ſo labour to reconcile them.

Firſt, that the Fathers were not carried over into Sychem.

Secondly, that they were not laid in the ſepulchre of Abraham.

Third-

Thirdly, that Abraham bought the field of *Ephron the ſonne of Zohar*, Gen. 23. 8.

Fourthly, that Hemor was the ſonne of Sychem, as the Vulgat and Genevean tranſlations have it.

That the firſt propoſition may be reconciled to his oppoſite, let us examine what is meant by the word *Fathers*. All the Patriarchs indeed were Fathers, and ſo called: *Abraham is our Father*, ſay the Jews, Joh. 8. 39. and, *Art thou greater then our Father Jacob?* ſaith the woman to Chriſt, Joh. 4. 12. *I am the God of thy Fathers, the God of Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob*, ſaith God himſelf, or an Angel repreſenting him, Act. 7. 32. *Abraham was a great Father*, Eccluſ. 44. 19. Theſe Patriarchs were *Patres majorum gentium, Fathers of the higheſt rank:* if I may accommodate the Romane diſtinction unto the Jewiſh Governours. And whereas David is called, Act. 2. 29. according both to the Greek and Latine, *a Patriarch*; there by the Arabick Tranſlatour he is termed *Princeps Patrum, The chief* or *Prince of the Fathers*. Yet in the ſenſe of S. Stephen, by the word *Fathers*, thoſe firſt or greateſt Fathers, and prime Patriarchs are not to be underſtood: but the *Patres minorum gentium, Fathers of a lower degree*; onely Joſeph and the other ſonnes of Jacob, the immediate Fathers and Heads of the twelve Tribes. And this is apparent by the light of the words themſelves; where there is a wall of ſeparation between the one and the other, Act. 7. 15. *Jacob died, he and our Fathers:* therefore there were ſome who were called Fathers, after Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob. *Jacob died, he and our Fathers:* Not Abraham and Iſaac; for they died before Jacob: but *Jacob died*; and who els? *He, and our Fathers:* What more? *He, and our Fathers* (when they were dead) *were carried to Sychem*. But Abraham and Iſaac were never carried to Sychem. Again, ſuch Fathers are meant as died in Egypt; (for they that died in Canaan needed no carrying over to the place where they were) and *Jacob went down into Egypt, and died* there, *he, and our Fathers*. But Abraham, though he went down into Egypt, yet died not there; but he *went up out of Egypt, he, and his wife, and all that he had*, Geneſ. 13. 1. leſt you might think, that he by leaving ought behinde might be occaſioned to return into Egypt. And Iſaac was never in Egypt; therefore could not die there. Jacob died, and his bones were removed to the ſame ſepulchre where his father and grandfather lay; which was not in Sychem, but in Hebron: Therefore the word *Fathers* cannot be fitted in this place to Abraham, Iſaac, or Jacob; but to the twelve Patriarchs (as S. Stephen calleth them) the ſonnes of Jacob. For both Abraham and Sarah, Iſaac and Rebekah, Jacob and Leah, were buried *in the cave that is in the field of Machpelah* by Hebron, Gen. 49. 31.

but Joſeph his bones were buried in Sychem, Joſh. 24. 32. Laſtly, the reſt of the Fathers the brethren of Joſeph were buried in Sychem, as well as Joſeph: for S. Hierom proveth it by their ſepulchres extant at Sychem, and viſited, as their ſepulchres, in his dayes; who is to be beleeved, and was an *eye-witneſſe*, ſaith Beza: So that the firſt-ſeeming contradiction is ſalved up: Joſeph and his brethren, the twelve Patriarchs, were thoſe Fathers which died after Jacob, and were tranſlated into Sychem, and there buried: Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob were not thoſe Fathers: for onely one of them died in Egypt, and all three were buried by Hebron, and needed not to be, nor were tranſlated to Sychem.

2. The ſemblance of the ſecond oppoſite propoſition, inforceth me to handle this point, Whether the brethren of Joſeph, the twelve Patriarchs, were buried in the ſepulchre of Abraham at Hebron, which he bought, and where himſelf was buried. Joſephus, *Antiq.* 2. 8. ſaith, *All the ſonnes of Jacob were buried in Hebron, except Joſeph, who was buried in Sychem.* Yea the words of S. Stephen are very punctuall, That the Fathers were laid in the ſepulchre which Abraham bought. On the contrary, we proved before, that the ſonnes of Jacob were buried in Sychem. Some do anſwer, *Poſiti ſunt in ſepulchro, They were laid in the grave,* is to be referred to Jacob onely; and that the Scripture uſeth the plurall number ſometimes, when in exactneſſe it belongeth to one onely; *poſiti* for *poſitus, more buried*, for *one buried*. But this is forced, and the great difficultie remaineth, concerning the names of them that ſold the ground.

The maker of the School-hiſtorie, Carthuſian, and Gagneius, ſay, *The twelve Patriarchs dying in Egypt, were buried in Sychem, and then tranſlated to Hebron; and the monuments of their ſepulchres might be in both places.* And ſo all may be true, what S. Stephen, Joſephus, and Hierom ſay. Of this tranſlation of their bodies (which I approve not) more hereafter.

3. The true way of anſwering even to this point, will be found in the attoning of the third different propoſition. *Abraham bought the ſepulchre of the ſonnes of Hemor*, ſaith S. Stephen: *Abraham bought the ſepulchre of Ephron the ſonne of Zohar*, ſaith Moſes, Gen. 23. 8. &c. Some ſay the ground was twice bought, once by Abraham, once by Jacob: others ſay, the ground and the men had each of them ſeverall names, and that Ephron was called Hemor. Others ſay, with ſome likelihood, that the father of Ephron, of whom Abraham bought the ground and the cave, had two names; the one was *Zohar*, Geneſ. 23. 8. the other *Hemor*, and ſo called by S. Stephen. Neither can I ſay ought againſt theſe expoſitions, ſave this, That I ſee nothing to prove them but conjecture.

But

But others, who no way can digeſt that the twelve Patriarchs were buried in Sychem, and thence tranſlated to Hebron, but ſay that their bones, bodies, and ſepulchres remained at Sychem, are driven to flie unto this ſtrong hold, That Abraham bought not the ſepulchre of the ſonnes of Hemor, nor did S. Stephen mean ſo; but τὸ *Abraham*, is taken *patronymicé*: for the fathers name is often uſed for the childe or children; as Iſrael, Edom, Moab, for their off-ſpring. So Geneſ. 11.12. *Arphaxad begat Salah*: Where Arphaxad is ſet for his ſonne: for Arphaxad begat Cainan, and Cainan begat Salah, Luk. 3.36. Likewiſe, 1. King. 12.16. *What portion have we in David?* (ſay the revolting Iſraelites) *neither have we inheritance in the ſonne of Jeſſe; to your tents, O Iſrael: now ſee to thine own houſe, David.* By *Iſrael* he meaneth the people of Iſrael: or his *deſcendants* after many generations are called *himſelf*, by the name of *Iſrael*. By *David* and *the ſonne of Jeſſe*, you muſt not underſtand the perſon of *David* himſelf, or *Solomon* his ſonne, but Jeſſe his great grand-childe, David his grand-childe; the ſonne of Solomon, *Rehoboam*; exactly parallelling our inſtance. Again, Abraham is ſaid to be *Levi his father*, Heb. 7. 10. but Jacob was Levi his immediate father: ſo even there *Abraham* in ſome ſort ſupplieth the room of *Jacob*; and *Abraham* is taken for *Jacob*. Yea, I may boldly and truely proceed yet further, and ſay, that David is called *the father of Ezekiah*, Iſa. 38. 5. though there were twelve generations from David to him: and David is called *the ſonne of Abraham*, Matth. 1.1. though there were *fourteen generations from Abraham to David*, Matth. 1.17. If predeceſſours ſo many deſcents removed be called Fathers; the grand-childe may be called by the grand-fathers name. The ſumme is, *Abraham* is not here the proper name of the Father of the faithfull; but it muſt be expounded of *Jacob* the grand-childe of Abraham. For indeed *Jacob* the grand-childe of Abraham, *bought the ground of the ſonnes of Hemor the father of Sychem*, Joſh. 24.32. To confirm this, that *Abraham* ſhould be more handſomely taken for his ſonnes ſonne *Jacob*, I found it in a margin-note of Druſius, *Præteritor. lib.* 5. thus, *Abraham, that is, the ſonne of Abraham*: where he makes τὸ *Abraham* to be the Genitive caſe, and *filius* to be underſtood. So Vatablus doth: and Martinus Cantapretenſis is expreſſe, that *Abraham* is the Genitive caſe: and Gaſparus Sanctius likes it, who ſaith, that *among the Hebrews the parents names are put in the Oblique caſe; and in them their ſonnes are underſtood: as Luke* 3.24. Τοῦ Ματθὰτ, τοῦ Λευὶ, τοῦ Μελχὶ, τοῦ Ἰαννά· *Which was the ſonne of Matthat, which was the ſonne of Levi, which was the ſonne of Melchi, which was the ſonne of Janna.* This is a wittie expoſition, and moſt excellent, if any copie of the Greek had read it τοῦ Ἀβραάμ, or any Latine copie had it *filius Abraham*: for *filius Abraham* might

extend, not onely to Iſaac, but to Jacob himſelf, and lower; for, in Scripture phraſe you ſhall finde the woman healed by Chriſt, Luk. 13. 16. called *a daughter of Abraham:* and Chriſt himſelf ſaith to the Jews, Joh. 8. 56. *Your father Abraham rejoyced.* So much for the reconciling of the ſecond and third Propoſitions; all being cleared by taking *Abraham* for a patronymick, for *Jacob.*

4. The fourth difference is, That in the Latine tranſlations it is read *à filiis Hemor filii Sychem.* But Hemor was *the father of Sychem,* Joſh. 24. 32. as is alſo proved Judg. 9. 28. where Gaal the ſonne of Ebed perſwaded the Sychemites to ſerve thoſe that deſcended from Hamor and Sychem, rather then Abimelech; as Vatablus collecteth. Peter Martyr ſaith, Gaals argument runneth thus, Serve rather thoſe who were ancient lords of this citie; and if we ſerved not them, ſhall we ſerve Abimelech? Where Gaal ſaid, *Who is Abimelech? and who is Sychem?* The Septuagint have it, τίς ἐστιν υἱὸς Συχέμ; *Who is the ſonne of Sychem?* But whether there were at this preſent in the reigne of Abimelech one Sychem living, and in high account, deſcended from the ancient Sychem, who was pointed at in theſe words, *Who is Sychem?* or whether any of Sychem his poſteritie (otherwiſe named) are here called *Shechem;* or whether Gaal made this αὔξησις, *augmentation, Who is Abimelech? yea, Who was Shechem himſelf* (for the word will bear it in the Originall) *that we ſhould ſerve him?* Which way ſoever it be, the place proveth, that Hamor was the father of Shechem: for ſo run the words afterwards in the ſame verſe, *Serve the men of Hamor the father of Shechem.* Again, if the words may be thus tranſlated, *Quis eſt Abimelech, & quæ eſt Shechem?* as both the Interlinearie and Tremellius reade it; the ſenſe may be, Abimelech is not ſo great, and the citie of Shechem is not ſo dejected, ſo forgetfull of its old libertie, as to ſerve Abimelech. Our old Biſhops Bibles reade it, *What is Abimelech, and what is Sychem? — Serve ſuch as come of Hemor the father of Sychem:* and in the margin is ſet, Geneſ. 34. 24.

Moreover, Junius in his Arabick tranſlation on the Acts, chap. 7. obſerveth, that τῷ Συχέμ, *Sychem,* is neither in the Arabick, nor Syriack, nor ſome Greek copies: and Beda in his Commentaries cited by Lorinus ſaith, that for *filii Sychem,* it is read in ſome copies, *qui fuit in Sychem,* ἐν Συχέμ, *who was in,* or *of Sychem:* accordingly Junius in his notes on the Syriack, Act. 7. ſaith thus, *What is read in the Greek,* viz. Τῷ Συχέμ, *may fitly be expounded by an Hebraiſm; and the name of the Prince of that citie may be underſtood; as if he had ſaid, Which he bought of the ſonnes of Hemor the Prince of Sychem.* Beza indeed ſaith, It may be read with the Vulgat, *the ſonnes of Sychem;* becauſe the

the Greek Ellipsis useth to be so supplied: but τῦ Συχέμ may as well be interpreted, *Patris Sychem*, *The father of Sychem*. You have the like instance, Luk.24.10. Μαρία Ἰακώβυ, *Marie the mother of James*, as the Syriack there expresseth it. Another proof of the like kinde, is Mark 15.40. So I expound it here, *The sonnes of Hamor*, τῦ Συχέμ, *the father of Sychem*. Thus much for the fourth couplet of Propositions, and the knitting up of that seeming opposition in a reall accordance, That Hemor or Hamor was the father of Sychem, as above all deniall is proved from Josh. 24. 32. though the Greek word used by S. Stephen be amphibolous. And now it is time to leave the severall answers to each particular doubt, and to render the sense of the words together.

5. One of these two wayes is (in my opinion) necessarie to be embraced:

First, that the twelve Patriarchs the sonnes of Jacob were carried out of Egypt into Sychem, and afterwards out of Sychem into the sepulchre of Abraham: And then behold these three difficulties: First, their father of whom Abraham bought the ground, must have two names. Secondly, it is hard and harsh to beleeve, that in the removall of the Patriarchs bones the Israelites would carrie them over to Sychem, and so passe by Hebron close to the *Abrahemium*, or the cave where Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, with their wives, were buried; and afterwards remove the bones back again from Sychem unto the sepulchre which Abraham bought, which is sixscore miles (if not more) if we measure from Hebron to Sychem, and so backward from Sychem to Hebron. Calvarie and the citie of Jerusalem lay almost even in the way from Goshen to Sychem, and from Sychem back to Hebron: And on Calvarie or there abouts, certainly they would have deposed their bones, if they desired the translation of them to rise with Christ. Thirdly, this exposition implieth, since Joseph was one of the Fathers, that Joseph was also buried in the sepulchre of Abraham; which is disproved by Josh. 24. 32. And yet, that we may make this Exposition passable and probable, let us consider the answers. The first difficultie is cleared by saying, It is an usuall thing in the Scripture for the same man to have two names; as Solomon is called *Jedidiah*, 2.Sam.12.25. and the like. To the second difficultie this answer may be shaped, That though we could see no reason, nor could imagine any end, why they should carrie and recarrie these bones; yet reasons and just motives might then lead them, which we now may be ignorant of. But I take it as evident, that the Israelites sooner and more quickly possessed the tribe of Ephraim, and the citie of Sychem (and therefore there might they leave their bones for a time) then Hebron

or

or Jeruſalem. For Joſhuah in his time called a Parliament or a Diet at Sychem, Joſh. 24. 1. and the Ephraimites peaceably enjoyed their inheritance in Joſhuah his dayes, and the Canaanites ſerved under tribute unto them, Joſh. 16. 10. But after Joſhuah his death, they wan Jeruſalem and Hebron, Judg. 1. 8,10. and then they might recarry the bones of the Fathers to the *Abrahemium* by Hebron. The third knot is looſed, if we may ſay, that all the Fathers were carried into Abrahams cave, who had not a diſtinct buriall-place of their own, as Joſeph had; who accordingly was not buried by Hebron, but by Sychem.

6. The ſecond way of expounding S. Stephen, according as the words lie in the Greek and Latine copies, is this; That the other Patriarchs the ſonnes of Jacob were buried by Sychem, as Joſeph was; and their bones brought up with his, when the Iſraelites came out of Egypt, and laid in the ſepulchre which Jacob the grandchilde of Abraham bought for a ſumme of money *of the ſonnes of Hemor the father of Sychem*, as is expreſſely ſaid, Joſh. 24. 32. Which latter way, for the accordance of words and names both in the Old and New Teſtament, I do moſt willingly embrace. For it repreſenteth not unto us ſo many or ſo great difficulties; yea none at all, ſince it was not ſo ſtrange that the word *Abraham* ſhould be a patronymick, and uſed for *Jacob*; eſpecially when Rehoboam is called *David*, and *the ſonne of Jeſſe*; and Abraham is ſaid to be *the father of Levi*, which Jacob was; and the Iſraelites are termed *Joſeph*, Pſal. 81. 5. though moſt of them deſcended not from him; and they who aſcended out of Egypt, iſſued from Joſeph after divers generations. In two of which places moſt punctually, as well as here, the grandfathers names are put for the grandchildren. Eſpecially let this be throughly conſidered, that the grandchilde himſelf is diſtinctly deſcribed in other places of the divine ſtorie, to have bought the ſame ground of the ſonnes of Hemor, about Sychem, *for an hundred pieces of money*, Gen. 33. 19. and the grandfather Abraham not to have bought that, but an other piece of ground, at an other time, in an other place, for * *foure hundred ſhekels of ſilver* of Ephron the Hittite, neare Hebron, which was farre diſtant from Sychem. Which ſale of Ephron, and purchaſe of Abraham, is ratified by the witneſſe of truth, in the mouth of Jacob himſelf, and dying Jacob, Geneſ. 49. 29, &c. Therefore though the name of *Abraham* be read; it may be, it muſt be a patronymick; and *Jacob* is called by his grandfathers name; and *Jacob* did what is aſcribed to *Abraham*: for other paſſages of Scripture do force us to expound it of Jacob.

* Geneſ. 23. 16, &c.

Thus have I digreſſed, to ſatisfie the great doubt which hath tortured the wits both of old and late Writers.

O Lord God, God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, God of our fathers, Father of Jesus Christ our God and Saviour; be pleased, I beseech thee, that these my poore weak labours in points obscure, may receive strength from thy strength, light from thy light; that thy most blessed, holy, and all-wise Word may be a lanthorn and light, not onely to my paths, but to my understanding: that so I may know thee, love thee, and alway cleaving to thee, may be glorified by thee, through Jesus Christ my Redeemer and Advocate. Amen.

CHAP. XI.

1. *Pineda makes Moses to be one of the raised at Christs Passion, if once he died. Pineda censured for his assertion, or rather his* hypothesis.

2. *David then arose in Pineda his judgement.*

3. *His Argument answered. Bishop* Bilson *wavering, and rejected, as he rejecteth S. Augustine.*

4. *A demonstration (upon S. Augustine his ground, and Act.2.24.) that David was not raised, nor ascended bodily into heaven.*

5. *Davids sepulchre now kept by the Turk.*

I Return to my old task against Pineda, and of him I demand, Who else are said to arise about the time of Christs Passion, besides Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob? He hath alreadie answered [a] *Moses also lived again, if long since he died once.* I answer; Why doth he make a needlesse *If?* The Scripture saith expressely, he *died*, Deut.34.5. and *he was an hundred and twentie yeares old when he died*, vers. 7. and he was *buried*, vers. 6. *If he died not, yet then first was he partaker of celestiall blessednesse*, saith Pineda, *after Christ was risen.* But in Christs life (say I) *Moses and Elias appeared in glory, and spake of his decease*, Luk.9.30, 31. They were not onely glorified, but they did appeare gloriously to Christ, and his Apostles, before his resurrection. And if S. Ambrose hath such words as Pineda citeth, we may trulier reply, [b] *We never read that Moses was*, or *was seen in heavenly glorie, after Christ arose, but before.*

[a] *At fuerit quoq; redivivus Moses, si olim diem suum obiit.*

[b] *Mosen unquam in cœlesti gloria legimus postquam, sed antequam Christus resurrexit.*

2. From

2. From this his pendulouſneſſe concerning Moſes, he deſcendeth to others, [c] *David was one of them, and was not excluded.* I confeſſe with the divine S. Auguſtine, that if any did ariſe to the eternall glory both of their ſouls and bodies, David may be thought to be one (neither then will I exclude Adam, Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob, and other Patriarchs under the law of Nature) but Auguſtine in the ſame 99 Epiſtle *ad Euod.* cited by Pineda, proveth by divers reaſons, that they who aroſe out of their graves, aroſe not then to an eternall happineſſe.

3. Yea, but Sophronius in his Sermon of the moſt bleſſed Virgins Aſſumption, evinceth (ſaith Pineda) that David did then ariſe; becauſe S. Peter, ſpeaking of the death of David, Act.2.20. ſaith not, His bodie was at Jeruſalem; but, *His ſepulchre is with us.* Cajetan on Aquin. *part.*1. *quæſt.* 53. *artic.*3. addeth (aſcribing it to Hierom) that S. Peter ſaid, [d] *Whoſe SEPULCHRE is with us; as if he durſt not ſay, Whoſe BODIE is with us.* Biſhop Bilſon in the place afore-cited, is either for us, or dubious, in the rere or end, although he be peremptorie and adverſe to us in the front and beginning: for he holdeth, That it would ſomewhat impeach the power of Chriſts reſurrection, if it were able to raiſe the Saints to life, but not to preſerve them in life. I anſwer, The queſtion is not of what Chriſt *could do,* or *can do*; but what he *did do,* and what *was done.* *A Poſſe ad Eſſe non valet argumentum.* And if he imagineth that it impeacheth the power of Chriſts reſurrection, unleſſe *de facto* the raiſed Saints be now alive in their bodies, (which is his intent;) any indifferent reader will ſay he is amiſſe, and ought not to ſquare the power of Chriſts reſurrection to his own fancie. Yea, but ſaith he, *The whole fact will ſeem rather an apparition, then a true reſurrection.* I anſwer, If he take *apparition* for a phantaſticall viſion, and meer imagination, or a deluſion of the ſenſes, his meaning is not to be ſuffered: yet in a good ſenſe and at large it may be called *an apparition*; for *they appeared unto many,* Matth.27.53. A true apparition, and as true a reſurrection. A true reſurrection is of two ſorts: the *firſt,* and the *laſt*; a *good,* and a *better* reſurrection: of which I ſpake before. One *eternall*: Such was Chriſts; *Chriſt dieth no more, death hath no more dominion over him,* Rom.6.9. and, *He hath the keyes of death,* Revel. 1. 18. yea, he alone was bleſſed with this reſurrection: hereafter we ſhall; *Every man in his own order. Chriſt the firſt-fruits, afterward they that are Chriſts, at his coming,* ſaith the Apoſtle, 1.Cor.15.23. The very time is expreſſed. S.Paul wrote this after Chriſts firſt coming; yea after his reſurrection many yeares: and therefore you muſt needs interpret it of his ſecond coming, as is moſt evident by the context: Therefore either thoſe

[c] *Neque abfuerit omnino David.*

[d] *Cujus* ſepulchrum *apud nos eſt; quaſi non auſus fuerit dicere, cujus* corpus *apud nos eſt*

thoſe Saints are not Chriſts, or they ſhall ariſe at his laſt coming; and therefore have not riſen to an eternall reſurrection. The other true reſurrection is *temporarie:* Thus ſome were raiſed in the Old Teſtament, and ſome in the New: and though they died again, I dare not ſay their reſurrection was an apparition. And as out of doubt ſome of them who were raiſed by the Prophets, or by Chriſt in his life time, died ſooner then other: ſo if any of them had died within three or foure dayes, yea within an houre or two after that their reſurrection; yet had it not been an *apparition* onely, but a true *temporary reſurrection.* As, if a childe ſhould die the third inſtant after the ſouls infuſion, there were a true union, and a true death: ſo if one ſhould die again preſently after a reſurrection, there muſt needs be both a true reunion, reſurrection, and a ſecond death; God reuniting the ſoul, and again ſeparating it, and diſpoſing of the creature without its wrong, to the glorie of the Creatour.

If I be bold with Biſhop Bilſon, he is as bold with S. Auguſtine, and ſleighteth his reaſons, and croſſeth the very argument which Aquinas magnifieth, and which we have now in hand concerning David. All the Reverend Biſhops words are too large to be tranſcribed; you may reade them, pag. 217. and 218. I will onely ſingle out ſuch paſſages, as ſhew him to be ſingular or dubious in that point. *That David is not aſcended into heaven, doth not hinder* (ſaith he) *but David might be tranſlated into Paradiſe with the reſt of the Saints that roſe from the dead when Chriſt did: but it is a juſt probation, that Davids bodie was not then aſcended, when Chriſt ſat in his humane nature at the right hand of God.* Again he ſaith, *Auguſtine hath ſome hold to prove that David did not aſcend in body when Chriſt did, or at leaſt not into heaven, whither Chriſt aſcended: becauſe in plain words Peter ſaith,** DAVID IS NOT ASCENDED INTO HEAVEN. *But* (ſaith he) *either the bodies of the Saints ſlept again, when they had given teſtimonie to Chriſts reſurrection: or they were placed in Paradiſe, and there expect the number of their brethren, which ſhall be raiſed out of the duſt: or laſtly, David was none of theſe that were raiſed to bear witneſſe of Chriſts reſurrection; but onely ſuch were choſen, as were known to the perſons then living in Jeruſalem.* So farre Biſhop Bilſon.

* Acts 2.34.

Before I come to preſſe the argument, let me deſire the Reader to obſerve theſe things in the forecited words, and to cenſure accordingly. That the Saints may be in *Paradiſe* with their bodies, but not in *Heaven.* Is there any paradiſe but in heaven? and when S. Paul was in paradiſe, was he not in the third heaven? Shall the Saints that roſe upon Chriſts reſurrection, and (if they aſcended at all) aſcended upon his aſcenſion, Shall they, (I ſay) be taken up from the earth,

and not be glorified? or being glorified, not be with Chriſt? Shall they be kept at diſtance from the bleſſed ſpirits of Angels and men, that attend upon the Lambe; and hang between the earth and that heaven where their Redeemer reigneth? Secondly, againſt his former determination, and againſt the reaſons which he brought to confirm it, he ſaith, *Either the bodies of the Saints ſlept again,* (But doth it not impeach the power of Chriſts reſurrection? or will it not ſeem an apparition, rather then a true reſurrection, as you before reaſoned?) *or they were placed in Paradiſe, or David was none of thoſe who were raiſed to bear witneſſe of Chriſts reſurrection.* You ſee now his reſolution is come down; but S. Auguſtines argument is ſound, that David was not excluded from that priviledge, which other ancient Fathers and Patriarchs enjoyed, if they enjoyed them. Biſhop Bilſon himſelf confeſſeth, that David aſcended not when Chriſt aſcended; but Chriſt ſat in his humane nature at the right hand of God, when Davids bodie was not aſcended. If not then, when did he or they aſcend? or how were they witneſſes of his aſcenſion? Laſtly, that the Fathers before Chriſt were in bliſſe, is out of doubt: that they were in ſome manſion of heaven, is probable: that they were comforted and made happier by Chriſts exaltation, may be beleeved: But that either the ſouls of the Patriarchs, and David, are not with the other bleſſed Angels and ſpirits of men now where Chriſt is; or that the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts, and other moſt holy diſciples of Chriſt, do not follow the Lambe whereſoever he now is, but are in a paradiſe out of heaven; ſeems ſtrange divinitie, ſomewhat touching on the errour of the Chiliaſts. But I leave Biſhop Bilſon, in this point unlike himſelf; he being a chief of our worthies, famous above thouſands for a moſt learned Prelate.

4. And if from the ground of S. Auguſtine, and the words of S. Peter, I do not demonſtrate that David roſe not to an eternall reſurrection; I am much deceived. The confeſſed ground of S. Auguſtine is, That it is hard and harſh to exclude David from being one that aroſe, if any aroſe, to eternall life: ſo that if David aroſe not, none may be thought of them ſo to ariſe, as to aſcend in their immortall bodies to heaven; ſince he had greater gifts or priviledges then ſome of them, and as great as almoſt any of them. But ſay I, David was none of thoſe that aroſe; or if he did, he aſcended not into heaven. And this I will undertake to prove by S. Peter. For firſt, S. Auguſtine in the ſame Epiſtle ſaith, The intent of S. Peter was to prove that theſe words, Pſal. 16. 10. *Thou ſhalt not leave my ſoul in hell, neither wilt thou ſuffer thy holy one to ſee corruption,* were ſpoken of Chriſt onely, and not of David: and the Apoſtle evinceth it by this reaſon, Becauſe David did die,

die, and was buried, and *his ſepulchre is with us*, that is, his bones and his bodie, and his aſhes are yet with us: whereas if David had bodily aſcended, they would have fitted David as well as Chriſt; who died, and was buried, and his ſepulchre remained; but his bodie was not incinerated, neither was his fleſh corrupted, as Davids was, but aſcended: And ſo the Apoſtles argument had been impertinent. Secondly, it is ſaid moſt remarkably, Act. 2. 34. *David is not aſcended into the heavens:* But Chriſt is by Davids confeſſion.

Note firſt the force of the *Antitheſis*. Secondly, obſerve that S. Peter ſpake this after Chriſts aſcenſion into heaven; whereas if any aroſe to incorruptible glorie, they aroſe or aſcended with Chriſt; and ſo, by juſt conſequent, before this time when S. Peter ſpake theſe words: yet the Apoſtle ſaith, Οὐ γὰρ Δαβὶδ ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς, *He is not yet aſcended*, or, *He hath not aſcended into the heavens*. Again, though David were in heaven in his ſoul long before that time, as we ſay; or if he went up out of *Limbus Patrum*, as ſome Papiſts ſay: yet certainly ſomeway he was not aſcended, when S. Peter thus preached. If any way he aſcended not, it muſt needs be in *bodie* or *ſoul*. They dare not ſay, He aſcended not in *ſoul:* and therefore we may boldly ſay, He aſcended not in *bodie*; unleſſe they will ſhew us ſome third nature in David that might aſcend, which thwarteth both Philoſophie and Divinitie.

5. Moreover, the Turks now inhabiting Jeruſalem keep the ſepulchre of David, forbidding entrance to all Chriſtians into it, as every traveller into thoſe parts knoweth; and they queſtionleſſe reſpect the ſepulchre, as containing the bodie, bones, or aſhes of David there preſent and unremoved. Laſtly, if David aſcended not when Chriſt did, or a little after, which is evidenced from the words of S. Peter; our enemies themſelves will not ſay that he aſcended long after, or of late: Therefore David is not aſcended bodily as yet, howſoever Pineda fancieth.

O Moſt mercifull Saviour, the ſonne of David, the Lord of David; who haſt ſupereminently the Key of David; and openeſt and no man ſhutteth, and ſhutteſt and no man openeth: when in all contriteſt humilitie I caſt my ſelf down to the gates of hell, I beg, and call, and crie unto thee, that thou wouldeſt ſhut them; And open unto me (I beſeech thee) the gates of heaven, and lift up for me thoſe everlaſting doores, that I may come in to thee the King of glorie, and ſit at the feet of thy ſervants in thoſe celeſtiall manſions. Grant this, O moſt Bleſſed Jeſu, for thine own ſweet name ſake, and for the merit of thy death and paſſion. Amen.

and not be glorified? or being glorified, not be with Chriſt? Shall they be kept at diſtance from the bleſſed ſpirits of Angels and men, that attend upon the Lambe; and hang between the earth and that heaven where their Redeemer reigneth? Secondly, againſt his former determination, and againſt the reaſons which he brought to confirm it, he ſaith, *Either the bodies of the Saints ſlept again,* (But doth it not impeach the power of Chriſts reſurrection? or will it not ſeem an apparition, rather then a true reſurrection, as you before reaſoned?) *or they were placed in Paradiſe, or David was none of thoſe who were raiſed to bear witneſſe of Chriſts reſurrection.* You ſee now his reſolution is come down; but S. Auguſtines argument is ſound, that David was not excluded from that priviledge, which other ancient Fathers and Patriarchs enjoyed, if they enjoyed them. Biſhop Bilſon himſelf confeſſeth, that David aſcended not when Chriſt aſcended; but Chriſt ſat in his humane nature at the right hand of God, when Davids bodie was not aſcended. If not then, when did he or they aſcend? or how were they witneſſes of his aſcenſion? Laſtly, that the Fathers before Chriſt were in bliſſe, is out of doubt: that they were in ſome manſion of heaven, is probable: that they were comforted and made happier by Chriſts exaltation, may be beleeved: But that either the ſouls of the Patriarchs, and David, are not with the other bleſſed Angels and ſpirits of men now where Chriſt is; or that the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts, and other moſt holy diſciples of Chriſt, do not follow the Lambe whereſoever he now is, but are in a paradiſe out of heaven, ſeems ſtrange divinitie, ſomewhat touching on the errour of the Chiliaſts. But I leave Biſhop Bilſon, in this point unlike himſelf; he being a chief of our worthies, famous above thouſands for a moſt learned Prelate.

4. And if from the ground of S. Auguſtine, and the words of S. Peter, I do not demonſtrate that David roſe not to an eternall reſurrection; I am much deceived. The confeſſed ground of S. Auguſtine is, That it is hard and harſh to exclude David from being one that aroſe, if any aroſe, to eternall life: ſo that if David aroſe not, none may be thought of them ſo to ariſe, as to aſcend in their immortall bodies to heaven; ſince he had greater gifts or priviledges then ſome of them, and as great as almoſt any of them. But ſay I, David was none of thoſe that aroſe; or if he did, he aſcended not into heaven. And this I will undertake to prove by S. Peter. For firſt, S. Auguſtine in the ſame Epiſtle ſaith, The intent of S. Peter was to prove that theſe words, Pſal. 16. 10. *Thou ſhalt not leave my ſoul in hell, neither wilt thou ſuffer thy holy one to ſee corruption,* were ſpoken of Chriſt onely, and not of David: and the Apoſtle evinceth it by this reaſon, Becauſe David did die,

die, and was buried, and *his ſepulchre is with us*, that is, his bones and his bodie, and his aſhes are yet with us: whereas if David had bodily aſcended, they would have fitted David as well as Chriſt; who died, and was buried, and his ſepulchre remained; but his bodie was not incinerated, neither was his fleſh corrupted, as Davids was, but aſcended: And ſo the Apoſtles argument had been impertinent. Secondly, it is ſaid moſt remarkably, Act. 2. 34. *David is not aſcended into the heavens:* But Chriſt is by Davids confeſſion.

Note firſt the force of the *Antitheſis*. Secondly, obſerve that S. Peter ſpake this after Chriſts aſcenſion into heaven; whereas if any aroſe to incorruptible glorie, they aroſe or aſcended with Chriſt; and ſo, by juſt conſequent, before this time when S. Peter ſpake theſe words: yet the Apoſtle ſaith, Οὐ γὰρ Δαβὶδ ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς, *He is not yet aſcended*, or, *He hath not aſcended into the heavens*. Again, though David were in heaven in his ſoul long before that time, as we ſay; or if he went up out of *Limbus Patrum*, as ſome Papiſts ſay: yet certainly ſomeway he was not aſcended, when S. Peter thus preached. If any way he aſcended not, it muſt needs be in *bodie* or *ſoul*. They dare not ſay, He aſcended not in *ſoul:* and therefore we may boldly ſay, He aſcended not in *bodie*; unleſſe they will ſhew us ſome third nature in David that might aſcend, which thwarteth both Philoſophie and Divinitie.

5. Moreover, the Turks now inhabiting Jeruſalem keep the ſepulchre of David, forbidding entrance to all Chriſtians into it, as every traveller into thoſe parts knoweth; and they queſtionleſſe reſpect the ſepulchre, as containing the bodie, bones, or aſhes of David there preſent and unremoved. Laſtly, if David aſcended not when Chriſt did, or a little after, which is evidenced from the words of S. Peter; our enemies themſelves will not ſay that he aſcended long after, or of late: Therefore David is not aſcended bodily as yet, howſoever Pineda fancieth.

O Moſt mercifull Saviour, the ſonne of David, the Lord of David; who haſt ſupereminently the Key of David; and openeſt and no man ſhutteth, and ſhutteſt and no man openeth: when in all contriteſt humilitie I caſt my ſelf down to the gates of hell, I beg, and call, and crie unto thee, that thou wouldeſt ſhut them; And open unto me (I beſeech thee) the gates of heaven, and lift up for me thoſe everlaſting doores, that I may come in to thee the King of glorie, and ſit at the feet of thy ſervants in thoſe celeſtiall manſions. Grant this, O moſt Bleſſed Jeſu, for thine own ſweet name ſake, and for the merit of thy death and paſſion. Amen.

CHAP. XII.

1. *Pineda doubteth whether Ananias, Azarias, and Miſael, were raiſed at Chriſts Paſsion; becauſe there now are ſaid to be ſome reliques of them;* ſome at Rome, and ſome at Venice, *ſaith Lorinus.*

2. *Other reliques. The table at which Chriſt ate with his Apoſtles. Some hairs, ſaid to be the hairs of our glorious Saviour: others, of his all-gracious mother. A bone of Philips. A ſandal of S. Peters.*

3. *S. Peters chain miraculous, as they report.*

4. *Mr. Mountague, now the reverend Biſhop of Chicheſter, defended.*

5. *S. Pauls chain alſo miraculous, from Gregorie and Bellarmine.*

6. *Falſe reliques taxt by Eraſmus and Calvin. John the Baptiſt* Τετράκρανος, *ſuppoſed to haue three heads at the leaſt. Three or foure prepuces of Chriſt.*

7. *Reliques before Chriſts time. The ark. The holy oyl. The rod of Moſes and Aaron. The throne of Eternitie fancied by the Jews. The horns of Moſes. One finger of the holy Ghoſt. The Papiſts faults in forging of falſe reliques.*

8. *All Reliques are not falſe. What reſpects are to be denied to true Reliques:*

9. *What are to be given.*

10. *No likelihood of the raiſing up of Ananias, Azarias, and Miſael, about Chriſts paſſion.*

THe ſame Pineda is a little more reſerved in the perſons following; for he onely addeth this, *I would ſay that Ananias, Azarias, and Miſael did now ariſe alſo; but that their reliques are ſaid to remain this day amongſt men. Part at Rome, part at Venice,* ſaith Lorinus on Act. 2. 29. I marvell that neither Chriſt, nor any of his Apoſtles ever went to viſit them; that none of the primitive Church went ever on pilgrimage to them; and that none of the ancient Fathers ever mentioned them. And certes, I did think, till of late, that the

the Papists had no reliques beyond the dayes of the Apostles, or the birth of Christ. From that time they say (whatsoever they think) that they have store of them. That I may not reckon among them, the very same table whereat Christ sat with his blessed Apostles; *which was at Toledo*, saith Joannes Leo, in his first book of the historie of Africa; which Table being covered with pure gold, and adorned with great store of precious stones, was esteemed to be worth half a million of ducates; and was at the sack of Toledo transported into Africa. *They expose sometimes to shew, three hairs of the beard of Christ*, saith Mr. Morison. pag. 38. And, *part of the hairs of the most glorious mother of our Lord, and a bone of Philip the Apostle, to be seen at Venice*, saith the same authour. Pererius himself, *Disput. 45. in primum cap. Joannis Evang.* saith, *They shew the sandal of S. Peter in the Church of Oniedo in Spain.* And Baronius saith, *They have the chain with which S. Peter was tied at Jerusalem, when the Angel delivered him.* Of which they have, even to a wonder, strange and different relations.

3. For that chain being sent by Eudocia to her daughter Eudoxia to Rome (for the other chain and S. Peters sword were kept still at Constantinople) by divine miracle was conjoyned to that other chain, wherewith S. Peter was bound in Rome under Nero, whilest he was in prison. Here Baronius himself, *ad annum Christi 439 num. 7.* [a] *Ecclesiasticall records have it, that these two chains being compared together, are found to be of the same kinde, art, or fashion: and by miracle were coupled one to the other: and being joyned or united together, of two chains were made one.* In memorie of which chain, the kalends of August were made an holyday by the Bishop of Rome, and a Church dedicated to God, according to the name, *Sancti Petri ad vincula.*

[a] *Habent tabulæ Ecclesiasticæ, ambas has catenas simul collatas, ejusdem generis & artis inventas, sibi invicem miraculo copulatas, junctásque ac simul unitas, ex duabus unam effectam esse.*

4. Let me a little digresse in defence of my ancient friend and chamber-fellow Mr. Mountague, now the reverend Bishop of Chicheſter: who is not rigidly to be expounded, as he is by the furious Papists and Puritans: for though in his answer to the Gag, pag. 235. he saith, *Baronius observeth S. Peters chain was not found till Augustine was dead:* yet that learned Antiquarie could not be ignorant, that Baronius proveth, and proveth probably enough, the manner how it was kept by some of Herods ministers, and so downward. But he meaneth, as I expound him candidly, It was not found in the Church as a publick relique. For *it was not brought unto Constantinople, till Chrysostom was dead*, saith Baronius, *num. 5.* And in the dayes of Proclus there was a translation of those two chains of S. Peter from Jerusalem, or where they were kept, unto Constantinople; and shortly after, one of them was sent to Rome, as I said at first. And yet (that you may

see great Papists agreeing like *harp* and *harrow*) observe that *Petrus Thyræus* a learned Jesuit, *de locis infestis, part.3. cap.67.* citeth a Sermon of S. Chrysostoms, *de Adoratione catenarum S. Petri.*

5. I return from my digression, and will make Bellarmine also shake his chains. Bellarmine, *de reliq. Sanct.* 2. 3. tells out of S. Gregorie a strange storie of S. Pauls chains. Gregorie promised to send unto Constantia the Empresse some of the filings of the chains of S. Paul, if at least any part could be filed away. For the chains had this condition, that if a worthy partie desired them, part of them would presently be filed away; if the partie desiring were unworthy, though one took great pains with all his strength to file, yet he could file away nothing. A tough smith with a good file, would (in some mens judgement) confute this miracle.

6. Other Papists in other places do shew the prepuce of Christ, *which, being a doubtfull thing, they worship more then whole Christ*, saith Erasmus. If one should question, How is Christ risen? circumcised, or uncircumcised? perchance it would puzzle them.

But why say I so? when Tolet on Luk. 2. gathereth from Titus Bostrenus on the same place, *Antiquam concertationem extitisse de præputio Christi, That there was an old controversie concerning the prepuce of Christ.* But I answer, That the Commentarie on Luke ascribed to Titus, is spurious and of latter times, as Bellarmine, *de Scriptor. Ecclesiast. pag.*130. *ad annum Christi* 365. proveth. Yea, *even Chrysostom himself, and Cyrillus Alexandrinus, and Peleusiota (whom the supposed Titus doth often cite) were but children when the true Titus Bostrenus died*, saith Bellarmine. Thirdly, both Titus and Theophylact say, That Christ resumed the circumcised part at his resurrection. If they had but one authour of that antiquitie, that Christ left it on earth as a relique of his; how would they triumph? After this, Innocentius the third, somewhat above 400 yeares since, enquiring whether Christ did arise with his foreskin, saith, *Some beleeve it to be kept at S. Johns of Laterans: others say, Charles the great translated it to Aquisgrane; and afterwards it was left at Carosium*, and determineth nothing but this, [b] *It is better to referre all unto God, then rashly to determine any thing.* Yet in the sixth book of the revelation of S. Briget, cap. 112. it is said, That the glorious mother of our Lord, kept it about her whersoever she went.

[b] *Melius est, totum Deo committere, quàm aliquid temerè definire.*

I yet do question, (if it were so) Who kept it till Brigets dayes? and, Which is the true prepuce? that at Rome? or that which Charles the great received from an Angel, and left in Germanie, not at Rome? But these books of revelations may want credit with us; when the learned Francis Collius,

de

de ſanguine Chriſti, lib.5. diſput.8. cap.5. ſaith thus of a revelation in the very chapter, [c] *Though it be of moſt eſpeciall moment, yet it is not to be ſo thought of, as that it is impious or irreligious to differ from it.* If it be *maximi ponderis, of chiefeſt account, and of greateſt weight,* it is impious and irreligious to depart from it. But ſince he departs from one Legend, we may from the other.

[c] *Etſi ea ſit maximi ponderis, tamen non tanti, támque efficacis cenſenda eſt, ut ab ea diſcedere impium & irreligioſum fuerit.*

After this the prepuce of Chriſt was ſtoln, buried, loſt, found, torn in two pieces; and is now in high eſteem, if Cardinall Tolet on Luk.2. may be beleeved. The ſumme of his narration is this, *That 1527, when Rome was ſackt by the ſouldiers of the Duke of Burbon; one of them ſtole away, among other reliques, the prepuce of Chriſt, and buried it in a cellar; and, as he was dying, revealed what he had done. Pope Clement the ſeventh cauſed it to be ſearched for; yet it was not found. Thirty yeares after a Prieſt findes it, carrieth it to the land-ladie of the place: ſhe thrice trieth to untie the things wherewith it was covered; and thrice by a miracle is inhibited. Clarix a young virgin her daughter untieth all; and puts the prepuce firſt in a ſilver baſon, then in a ſilver casket: Thus it is plated in the Church of Calcata; then removed into the Chancel. Miracles are wrought. The Pope ſends Commiſsioners to ſearch the truth. One of the Prieſts, ere he was aware, tore the prepuce in two pieces;* (Is it ſtill *eadem numero membrana, the ſame numericall skinne,* O learned Collius?) *the Commiſsioners certifie it was the true relique of Chriſt; and it is kept at this day at Calcata, in the temple of S. Cornelius, and Cyrian, where God daily works miracles.*

In the yeare 1584, at a womans requeſt, Sixtus quintus granted plenarie indulgence for ten yeares, in the ſame Church of Calcata upon the day of our Lords Circumciſion. Thus farre Tolet.

You may obſerve, that from 1527 (when it was ſtolne by the ſouldier) to 1584, or perhaps, ſo long as the indulgences laſted, the prepuce of Chriſt was not in S. John of Laterans: and ſo, beſides the prepuce at Careſium, there are two other fore-skinnes of Chriſt on the earth; *One at Calcata, 20 miles from Rome, kept to this day,* ſaith Tolet, commenting on Luke: And the book was printed 1611. Of the other, Collius the Millanoiſe, *de ſanguine Chriſti, lib.5. diſput. 7. cap.2.* ſaith, *It is now kept at S. John of Laterans, in that place of the Church which is called* THE HOLY OF HOLIES, *as Innocent the third and the Cardinal S. Petri ad vincula, and Carthagena, and all and every of the writers of this age who have handled this point do ſay.* Collius might have excepted Tolet, whoſe preceding narrative checketh him. The ſame Collius, *ibid.* thinks it very credible, [d] *That Chriſt roſe not with that ſelf ſame fore-skinne which was cut off at his circumciſion, but by a divine vertue another new one was comproduced,* Chriſt being in heaven uncir-

[d] *Salvatoris præputium non reſurrexiſſe idem numero quod in circumciſione ceciderat; ſed divinâ virtute aliud fuiſſe comproductum.*

cumciſed: but yet he upholdeth the gainfull vanitie of Impoſtours, who deſerve to be branded; yea, to be burnt to aſhes, for feigning two or three fore-skinnes on earth of our Saviour.

I cannot forget their vaunts, That they have *intimam veſtem*, the *ſmock*, or at leaſt the *peticoat* of the moſt gracefull Virgin, and her milk, honoured almoſt as Chriſt his conſecrated bodie: The breeches of Joſeph: The combe of S. Anne (and *her very head*, ſaith Sleidan, *Comment.15. fol.* 170.) And *ſo many pieces of the croſſe, as would almoſt lade a ſhip of burthen*, ſaith Eraſmus on Matth.23.5. Calvin, *de inventor. reliquiarum*, proveth ſome of the Romiſh Saints to have three heads; ſome three bodies ſhewn in ſeverall places. The Rhemiſts on Matth. 14. *annot.* 2. ſay, *Honour is now done to the Baptiſts head at Amiens in France:* Fulk addeth, *The ſame part that is at Amiens, is at S. Angely; the reſt of his head, from his fore-head to his neck, is at Malta; yet the hinder part of his skull is at Nemours; his brain at Novium Raſtrovienſe; another part of his head is at Jean-Morien; his jaw-bone at Veſalium, at the Church of S. John the greater; another part at Paris; a piece of his eare at S. Floride; his fore-head and hairs in Spain at S. Salvadores; another piece of his head at Naion; another at Luke in Italie: and yet for all theſe pieces, his whole head is at S. Sylveſters Abbey at Rome, to be ſeen and worſhipped. Half of S. Peters bodie is at S. Peters at Rome; half at S. Pauls: yet he hath an head at S. John Laterans; and his nether-jaw with the beard upon it, is in France at Poyters; at Triers are many of his bones, at Geneva was part of his brain*, ſaith Fulk *in Rom.16. annot.* 1. See Sleidan *Comment.* 15. *pag.* 169. ſumming up a book of Calvins to the ſame purpoſe.

I could make you laugh in diſdain at what a chief printer at Paris hath written in his preface to the defence of Herodotus, touching theſe horrible impoſtures, and the ſudden quick-couſening wits of the Friars: as how a ſtrange feather was promiſed to be ſhewn for a holy relique, as being one of an Arch-angels feathers: and when a cunning hand had ſtoln it away, and placed a coal in the room of it; the nimble jugling Friar perſwaded his beſotted auditorie, that they were unworthy to ſee ſo great a relique as an Arch-angels feather; but God had ſent, in ſtead of it, one of the very coals with which S. Laurence was broiled to death; and thereupon ſhewed them the coal which was foiſted in.

7. He that would rake this ſink, might have his noſe full. I muſt aſcend ſomewhat higher, and whereas I imagined no reliques were found beyond Chriſt, now Salianus, *annal.tom.* 6. *pag.*34. ſaith from report, that the heads of the ſeven brethren martyrs, 2.Macc.7.1. &c. are in a Nunnerie at Cullein, in

in a Church of the Maccabees ſo called 400 yeares ſince. And Pineda tells us, that the reliques of Ananias, Azarias, and Miſael, are reported to remain: and not thoſe onely; for Lorinus on Act. 7. 44. ſaith, *The Scholaſticall hiſtorie reporteth, that the Ark was carried in triumph at Rome; and is kept in the Church of Lateran.* Lorinus indeed diſliketh that opinion: but it may paſſe as well as this, *That unto Lewis the eleventh were brought the holy oyl, and the rod of Moſes and Aaron*; as the French hiſtorie hath it at the end of his life. How miſſed they a piece of Noahs Ark? (for I take it, that the Scholaſticall hiſtorie ſpeaketh of the *Arca Teſtamenti*) and the fruit of ſome of the trees of Paradiſe? A parcell of the *Tohu-Bohu* had been an excellent relique; as the primitive and ancienteſt remainder of the unformed lump and maſſe of the firſt immediate creation. For a piece of that Nothing out of which the *Tohu-Bohu* was made, cannot be had, ſince Nothing hath no parts.

If the Papiſts did think with the Jews, that *Solium Æternitatis, The Throne of Eternitie*, was one of thoſe things, which was made before the grand creation (as Mr. Calvin relateth concerning the Jews, on Micah 5. 2.) ſome of the Papiſts perhaps would outſtrip the Jews, and ſay, that they had a relique even of that Throne.

In no foolerie have the Papiſts prejudiced themſelves, more then in this; yea, they are not onely come to that degree of infatuation, as to feigne that they can ſhew the horns of Moſes (which were meerly *non entia, none at all*; growing onely in the imagination of the deceivers, and deceived) but they are carried even εἰς τὸ ὑπερβολὴν τῆς μανίας, *to that height of madneſſe*, that they ſay, they have had (*horreſco referens, I quake to write it*) one of the fingers of the holy Ghoſt; which was a moſt blaſphemous impoſture, I had almoſt ſaid, μεῖζον συγγνώμης, *above and beyond pardon.* See Mr. Sheldon in his book concerning the miracles of Antichriſt, pag. 335. Sleidan, *Comment. 4. fol. 37. ad annum Dom.* 1624. ſaith, That among other things it was decreed in an aſſembly of the Helvetians at Lucerna, thus; • *Let not them be laughed at, who carrie about the reliques of the holy Ghoſt, of the Virgin Mary, of S. Antonie.* And yet the ſame Sleidan, *Comment. 12. fol.* 129. makes it to be a part of the very pretended reformation, to be made even by the Papiſts themſelves, *That they who carry about the reliques of S. Antonie, are to be put down; becauſe they lead the people into ſuperſtition, and cozen them.* Their own learned Valla and Vives reproved this mercenary juggling; and long before them, *Glaber Rodulphus Cluniacenſis Monachus, in Hiſtoria ſui temporis, lib. 4. cap. 3.* tels ſtrange ſtories of *Leger de la main* about reliques, and of their working of miracles, which he aſcribeth

• *Qui ſancti Spiritûs, Mariæ virginis, divi Antonii circumferunt reliquias, à nemine rideantur.*

to

to devils, or humane errours. Likewiſe, the moderate ingenuous, unſiding, learned George Caſſander, *Conſult. art.* 21. hath branded them, and giveth ſome advice concerning them, eſpecially againſt the falſe reliques.

8. I ſpeak not unreverently of any true relique, and I think many both Orientall and Occidentall reliques were and are true; and fully beleeve, that divers holy reliques were in this laſt age torn down, and buried in ruines, by thoſe ſacrilegious hot-brains in the giddie whirl; or by thoſe Turkiſh acquiſts, which in a whirlwinde regarded more the benefit of ſinfull men, then the good of ſouls, or glory of God in the beautie of his Churches.

If I could ſee one undoubted ancient relique of the beſt ſort, (for they do much differ) I would *reverence*, though not *worſhip* it. [f] *The martyrs are to be very highly eſteemed, yet not to be adored as God,* ſaith Ludovicus Vives on Auguſtine *de Civit. Dei*, 8.27. and eſtabliſheth it out of Hierom. The ſame ſay I of reliques: and thus expound my ſelf in particulars; Firſt, negatively; Secondly, poſitively. I would not kneel unto any relique, much leſſe pray unto it; nor ſay (as the Papiſts do) to the *Sudarium Chriſti,* [g] *Holy napkin pray for us, and free us from the plague.* Or to the linen handkerchief of Veronica, [h] *All hail holy face, printed or ſtamped on this handkerchief; cleanſe us from all the blots of our ſinnes.* Nor to any part of the croſſe, or to all of it, if I ſaw it intire, would I crie, [i] *God ſpeed, O croſſe; do thou ſave us.* Yet ſuch idolatrie Scharpius imputeth to the Papiſts. I would not light lights before the bones or aſhes of a martyr; which Hierom condemneth as the dotage of ſuperſtitious women, who have zeal, but not knowledge. I would not erect altars, temples, or appoint holy dayes, or form a prayer to worſhip them; but to God for them. All theſe are derogatorie to the honour of the Almightie.

If I were ſure to have help if I prayed unto a relique, I would not pray, and would refuſe that help. I would not dig up the bodie, or any part of the bodie of the greateſt Saint buried, unleſſe it were buried in unſeemly and unfit places: then would I not worſhip it, but tranſlate it to a decent ſepulchre. The bodies of the Patriarchs, Jacob and Joſeph, were not taken up to be kept as reliques, but to be tranſlated to their ſeverall ſepulchres: and David cauſed the bones of his deareſt Jonathan, when they had been carried from Gilboah to the ſtreet of Beth-ſhan, from Beth-ſhan to Jabeſh-Gilead, to be buried in Zelah of Benjamin, in the ſepulchre of Kiſh, 2.Sam.21.12, &c. He kept them not for reliques, nor worſhipped them.

I would not give ſo much reverence to any relique, as I would

[f] *Venerandi ſunt martyres, non adorandi ut Deus.*

[g] *Sanctum ſudarium ora pro nobis, & libera nos à peſte.*

[h] *Salve ſancta facies, impreſſa panniculo; nos ab omni macula purga vitiorum.*

[i] *O crux, ave; ſalva nos.*

would to the Saint himſelf, if I were divinely aſcertained that the Saints ſoul preſented it ſelf in a ſhape unto me: and yet I would not fall down to worſhip that Saint; and ſhould I to his relique? I would not *religiosè venerari, religiouſly worſhip*, (as *Petrus Thyræus, de locis infeſt. part.1.cap.67. Theſi* 4. confeſſeth the Papiſts do:) But what ſaith ſober S. Auguſtine on Pſal.98.5. [k] *I am in a doubt: I am afraid to adore earth, leſt he damn me, who made both heaven and earth. In this heſitancie or pendulouſneſſe I turn my ſelf to Chriſt: and here I ſeek and finde, how without impietie earth may be worſhipped:* As if no earthly thing ſhould be adored, but his bodie onely:

I would not ſay or think, that any relique or reliques have in themſelves, or from themſelves power to expell devils, or to work wonders: for *a ſpirituall power* (as Thyræus well obſerveth, though it wound himſelf) *is not within a thing corporeall: and a bodily power cannot drive away devils*; or, work miracles, ſay I. The great works of healing, &c. which have been done at the tombes of Martyrs, (reade S. Auguſtine *de civitat. Dei*, 22.8.) might in thoſe dayes, extraordinarily, be done by the Martyrs; or by the Angels [l] *in aſſumed bodies like to the Martyrs*, as Auguſtine phraſeth it, *in lib. de cura pro mortuis gerenda, cap.16.*

The reliques have no vertue in themſelves, to effectuate or actuate ſuch miracles: yea, the very Angels or Martyrs themſelves, were but the agents, inſtruments, and the right hand of the Almighty, who onely worketh great wonders by his power independent.

I would put no truſt, no confidence in the relique of any Saint or Martyr whoſoever, or whatſoever, for help either of ſoul or bodie: For this alſo is a wrong offered unto him in whoſe name our help ſtandeth: *Our help cometh from the Lord, which made heaven and earth*, Pſal.121.2. And *my God ſhall ſupply all our need, according to his riches in glorie by Chriſt Jeſus*, Philip.4.19.

9. What would I then do? or how would I behave my ſelf toward a true, unqueſtioned, choice relique? I would (which is the poſitive part by me promiſed) with Chryſoſtom, *Hom.5.in Job, tom.* 1. honourably eſteem of it, kiſſe it, and reverently both touch it, and behold it, and think of it; and charily lay it up: I would ſhew it to others not mercenarily, but with joyfull and comfortable remembrance of him whoſe relique it was: I would eſteem of it above ſilver, gold, or precious ſtones: I would make it my remembrancer of things paſt; as a motive ſtirring me up to the imitation of that Saints vertues and actions, which is their beſt relique: I would uſe it as a bridle to curb evil in me, and as a ſpur to goodneſſe. If any inſtrument of Satan ſhould debaſe it, and ſay

k *Anceps factus ſum: timeo adorare terram, nè damnet me qui fecit cælum & terram: fluctuans converto me ad Chriſtum, quia ipſum quæro hîc, & invenio, quomodo ſine impietate adoretur terra.*

l *Suſcipientis perſonam Martyrum.*

say that it is *vilissimus pulvis*; I would scorn his scorn, and esteem it as a most especiall instrument of the most High; and would say to the caviller, or rather to his master Lucifer the Father of lies and detraction, m *Even this which thou calleſt most vile duſt, hath often tormented thee*, as S. Hierom said of old. Lastly, till of it self it decayed, and by its imperfection or rottennesse called for interment, I would not bury it: but commend it to be kept even in Churches and other holy places; except idolatrie were committed with it, or people in their profane religion adored it: And then would I also burie it.

m *Sæpe hoc vilissimo tortus es pulvere.*

10. Much more might be said, but I must take *manum de tabula*, or *make a quick end*; and, returning to Pineda, say, That if Ananias, Azarias, and Misael have no relique now remaining, which Lorinus reports from report; if they did arise, or intend to arise with Christ; they having a farre longer journey from the place of their captivitie to the sepulchre of Christ, then Jacob had to the land of Goshen, would or should have had as great a care as Jacob, of translating their bones, if Jacob translated his in hope to arise with Christ, as Pineda intimateth.

O Gracious God, who art to be loved by me for thine own self onely, Grant, I beseech thee, that no worldly thought may nestle and breed in me, nor that I may fasten any respect on any creature, which may be derogatorie to the devotion due to thee my Creatour, for Jesus Christ his sake, in whom onely thou art well pleased. Amen.

CHAP. XIII.

1. Pineda saith, Jonas arose then, and Noah. His reasons very shallow.

2. Daniel arose, saith Pineda from Nicetas. If Daniel arose, he arose but with one leg: the other leg is yet shewed at Vercellis.

3. Job arose now, saith Pineda. His proof lame. Jobs Epitaph poeticall. His sepulchrall pyramis *made of imagination.*

4. Job shall arise at the generall judgement. Pineda wrincheth the Scripture.

5. The

5. The end of Jobs book, according to ſome Greek copies: a double expoſition of the words.

6. Jobs bodie ſuppoſed to be tranſlated to Conſtantinople.

7. Bartholomæus Sibylla ſaith, S. Hierom is expreſſe, that the holy mother of our Lord, and John the Evangeliſt, are bodily aſcended. The like cited from Aquinas. And Holcot ſaith, That the glorious virgins bodie was not to be incinerated. Her ſuppoſed day of Aſſumption, moſt honoured among the Papiſts: and yet there is monſtrous diſagreeing among them who favour her Aſſumption. The laſt inſtances concern not our queſtion.

8. Pineda preſumed too farre upon uncertainties. Lorinus dareth not name any particularly that were raiſed. It cannot be known certainly.

NOw *alſo aroſe Jonah*, ſaith Pineda. That Jonas was a lively type of Chriſts reſurrection, appeareth Matth. 27. 40. But if every lively type of Chriſt aroſe, then Samſon, Samuel, Joſhuah, Gedeon, Melchizedech, Aaron, Solomon, then hundreds of others aroſe, whom Pineda mentioneth not. [a] *At laſt Noah aroſe*, ſaith Pineda. Why AT LAST? *ſince he was living before other, and great in Gods favour: who was ſaved and delivered from the common deſtruction of all mortall men.* This laſt reaſon as well holdeth, That every one that was in the Ark aroſe alſo: For they were delivered, as well as Noah, from the inundation of waters; and eſpecially Sem, who was an holy man, and was great in Gods favour.

[a] *Tandem reſurrexit Noah.*

2. *And Daniel aroſe, who was brought out of the lions den*, ſaith Pineda; and he proves it by Nicetas. But neither he, nor Nicetas proves it by any reaſon. He might as well argue, that Jeremie aroſe with Chriſt: Becauſe he being caſt into the dungeon where he ſunk in the mire, was afterwards drawn out of the dungeon, Jerem. 38. 6. and 13. And if Daniel aroſe, he aroſe but with one leg: for [b] *A leg of Daniel is kept at Vercellis, a citie of Liguria*, ſaith Lorinus on Act. 2. 29. *Daniel died in Babylon*, ſaith Sixtus Senenſis concerning him. Of reliques he makes no mention, nor of his riſing again with Chriſt: but alledgeth the laſt of Daniel, the laſt verſe: Which words may prove that he aroſe not with Chriſt; or, if he did, that he died again. For the Spirit ſaith to him, *Go thou thy way till the end be: for thou ſhalt reſt and ſtand in the lot at the end of the dayes*, IN FINE DIERUM. Which words are applied by Vatablus, to the reſurrection of the laſt judge-

[b] *Crus Danielis aſſervatur Vercellis, &c.*

ment; which was mentioned, Dan. 12. 2. And leſt any ſhould interpret *the riſing out of the duſt*, verſ. 2. (as Porphyrie did) for *their creeping out of the holes and caverns, in the time of the Maccabees*, Lyra expreſſely contradicteth it, and ſaith, it is to be underſtood [c] *of the true reſurrection in the end of the world*; implying, that Daniel ſhall *then* ariſe, as *he aroſe not*, ſaith Lyra, *at the time of the Maccabees, nor at the opening of the graves, before Chriſts reſurrection.*

[c] *De reſurrectione vera in fine mundi.*

[d] *Therefore moſt holy Job aroſe alſo*, ſaith Pineda, equalling Noah, Daniel, and Job, in this priviledge. But the conſequence is lame; for Ezechiel doth not mention the equall priviledges of theſe three, in their reſurrection, (though perhaps this latter is figured out) but onely the delivery from famine, or death by famine, (Ezech. 14. 13, &c.) of Noah, Daniel, and Job; or rather of other holy men alſo, deſigned out by their names, and like them in their ſeverall vertues: Noah overcoming the world, Daniel the fleſh, and Job the devil.

[d] *Ergò & reſurrexit Job ſanctiſsimus.*

Concerning Pineda his other proof, That Gregorie Niſſen, in his third Oration of the reſurrection, ſaith, *That the day of their reſurrection who aroſe out of the graves, was much more joyfull to them, then the day of the generall reſurrection:* If I ſhould grant, that he ſaid ſo, and that he ſaid ſo truely; yet it followeth not neceſſarily (ſcarce probably) that they went with their bodies into heaven. The day of the generall reſurrection is not yet come, and could not be rejoyced at but in hope.

More eſpecially concerning Job, though Salianus, *ad ann. mundi* 1544. *num.* 783. makes Jobs tombe-ſtone ſpeak thus, [e] *This ſtone, O wayfaring man, kept under it dead Job, and ſent forth alſo Job in glorie ariſing from the dead with Meßiah our Prince:* though Pineda, his fellow-Jeſuite, in the end of his Commentaries on Job, ſaith, That Jobs ſepulchral *pyramis*, and kingly monument, was made for him by his ſeven ſonnes and three daughters, and was framed and erected [f] *for an eternall memoriall of pietie, and moſt certain hope of his reſurrection with our Redeemer:* yet none is ignorant that theſe are tricks of wit, panegyrick Eulogies, poeticall Epitaphs, even a little thwarting one another, rather then divine truths, or hiſtoricall relations.

[e] *Clauſit, viator, hoc marmor aliquando mortuum, emiſitque glorioſum cum Principe Meſſia reſurgentem Jobum*

[f] *Ad pietatis memoriam ſempiternã, ſpémq; reſurrectionis cum Redemptore certiſſimam.*

4. And further it is evident that Job ſpake of the generall reſurrection, when he ſaid, Job 19. 25. &c. *I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he ſhall ſtand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin, worms deſtroy this bodie, yet in my fleſh ſhall I ſee God.* By which *latter*, or *laſt day*, we may fitly expound, not *the laſt day of judgement*, ſaith Pineda; *but the ſtate of the Evangelicall Law, and of Chriſts ſuffering and riſing; ending (by his death and reſurrection) the former times, and begin-*

beginning to appoint a new: for he is THE FATHER OF THE WORLD TO COME, Isa. 9. 6. Did ever man thus delude Scripture, and make it a nose of wax? It is scarcely worse used by our unlearned lay-Rabbies, the Doctours of Doctours. Who ever dreamed, that *Dies novissimus* should signifie so unlikely a matter? and if it did, how vain is his proof? The words are אֲבִי עַד, *Pater æternitatis*, *The father of eternitie*, as the Interlinearie Bible reads it, and Vatablus with it, expounding the words, [8] *The authour of eternall life*, (which hath no reference to Pineda's wilde Comment) or, *the everlasting Father*, as we translate it.

[8] *Author vitæ æternæ*

5. The Seventie indeed, and the Book of Job thus, *Job died, being old, and full of dayes:* so farre also goeth the Hebrew: and it is added in the Greek, *But it is written, that he shall again be raised up with those whom the Lord shall raise.* These words are not in the Original, nor in Aquila, nor in Symmachus, nor in the Seaventie used by Vatablus: but Theodotion so reads it, and the Vatican Edition of Sixtus so acknowledgeth it, and Origen in his epistle to Africanus confirmeth it, and Clemens Romanus, *cap. 5. lib. 6.* approveth it. Two wayes there are of expounding the word *Rursus, Again.* Francis Turrian the Jesuite, on the place of Clement, collecteth that Job shall not onely be raised up in the last day, at the generall resurrection: but that he should be first raised when Christ arose; and afterward, at the last day. Nicetas saith better, *The word AGAIN, was therefore put that his first resurrection might be understood to have been, when he was delivered from his troubles.* Which way soever you follow, we have it, That Job shall be raised at the last day of the world: And therefore he arose not with Christ: or died again, and so went not into the eternall happinesse of bodie and soul; for glorified bodies shall not be raised.

6. Lastly, there is an opinion even to this day, among the Turks, grounded no doubt on some old Tradition, *That Jobs bodie was removed from the place of his buriall, to that citie and place which is now called Constantinople,* as Mr. Fines Morison in the first part of his Itinerary, pag. 243. witnesseth. These are all that ever I read of by name, that are thought by Pineda, or others, both to rise with Christ, and to partake with him at that time of the eternall happinesse both in soul and bodie.

7. Bartholomæus Sybilla, *Peregrinarum quæstionum decade* 1. *cap.* 3. *quæst.* 7. *dubio* 3. citeth Henricus de Assia as Authour, that, *Perhaps, not onely Enoch and Elias are kept in Paradise, to preach against Antichrist; but both John the Evangelist, and those that rose with Christ. Observe,* saith Sybilla, *the word* PERHAPS: *for S. Hierom saith formerly, concerning S. John,* WE DOUBT

BUT BOTH S. JOHN THE EVANGELIST, AND THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARIE, DO REJOYCE IN THEIR GLORIFIED FLESH VVITH CHRIST. And Aquin. *in* 4. *ſentent. diſtinct.* 43. *artic.* 3. cited by Sybilla, ſaith, *It is a point of faith holily to be beleeved concerning the bleſſed Virgin Marie, and S. John the Evangeliſt, that their reſurrection is not deferred to the end of the world.*

[h] *Corpus benedictæ Virginis non fuit reſolvendum in cineres, quia in ea fomes extinctus extitit.*

Alſo Holcot ſaith, on Wiſdome, cap. 2. 2. [h] *The bodie of the bleſſed Virgin was not to be turned into aſhes, becauſe in her was no fountain of ill:* from whence her aſportation into heaven may ſeem to be confirmed. *The feaſt-day of her aſſumption is greater and more feſtivall then any other holy-day for her*, ſaith Durandus, *Rational.* 7. 24. Surely, I muſt needs ſay, we reade nothing certain concerning her death; nor is her bodie or her tombeſtone found on earth; nor did S. John the Evangeliſt, who out-lived her and the reſt of the Apoſtles, by all mens conſents, write any thing of her death, much leſſe of her aſſumption; though as Chriſt committed her to him, ſo he took her εἰς τὰ ἴδια, *to his own home*, & was *a ſonne* unto her, Joh. 19. 26, 27.

[i] *Monſtroſa quædam diſcrepantia reperitur.*

Amongſt thoſe who aſſent to her aſſumption, [i] *there is monſtrous diverſitie*, ſaith Baronius, *Anno Chriſti* 48. *num.* 4. Which words I wonder he would let drop from his pen, or that others of their ſide would ſuffer to be printed. Of the former inſtances I ſay the leſſe, becauſe if all which was ſuppoſed were granted, and if they had this priviledge to prevent others in their bodily glorie; yet it was long after Chriſts aſcenſion; whereas my principall queſtion was of thoſe many that aroſe about Chriſts Paſſion, Who in particular they were?

8. The ſumme is, Pineda hath taken great pains to little purpoſe; hath preſumed to name thoſe whom the Scripture or any ſound tradition hath left unnamed: his proofs have been ſo ſlender, as his conjectures have been bold. He convinceth not exactly, that any one of thoſe whom he ſpecializeth were raiſed; much leſſe to eternall happineſſe: and I have demonſtrated that ſome of thoſe whom he nameth did not then ariſe to a glorious immortalitie. In the particular inſtancing in thoſe who aroſe about Chriſts death, his fellow-Jeſuite dares not follow him; [k] *I dare not ſay peremptorily that any ſuch an one was raiſed*, ſaith Lorinus moſt modeſtly, on Act. 7. 29. Yet ſtill it muſt be confeſt, that *many bodies which ſlept aroſe, &c.* though the book be claſped, the ſecret reſerved, and no abſolute knowledge can inform us who they were.

[k] *Non auſim de ullo particulatim definire.*

O Lord who didſt open the eyes of the blinde, to thee do I confeſſe the blindeneſſe of my underſtanding: open, I beſeech thee, thoſe eyes of my minde, diſpell the clouds, leading me in the right way amidſt by-paths and uncertainties; even for thine own ſake, who art the onely way to the true life. So be it, Lord Jeſus; Amen, Amen.

CHAP. XIIII.

1. *My conjecture, that none of the Patriarchs or old Prophets were raised.*

2. *An objection, concerning Peters knowing of Moses and Elias on mount Tabor, answered.*

3. *A conjecture that the Saints who lived in Christs time, and died before him, were raised at his Passion: Who they were in most likelihood. When Joseph, the reputed father of Christ, did die.*

4. *The end, why they were raised. To whom they appeared.*

5. *A crotchet concerning the wives of dead men which have been raised.*

IF still you presse the question, *Who those* MANY *were?* or, *Who were some of those* MANY? I answer with Lorinus, that *part of truth lieth hid and covered.* Amongst conjectures, I propound this mine own as probable. First negatively, That none of the ancient Patriarchs, Prophets, or Types of Christ in the Old Testament, arose: for if one; Who is he? and why not others as well as he? and if they had risen, Who should have known them? or how could they induce the then living to beleeve that they were the same Patriarchs or Prophets? They might have been as well thought to have been incarnate spirits: for the evil spirits also kept about the tombes and graves of the deceased: Unlesse you will multiply miracles upon miracles; and say, God by miracle did reveal these to be true Patriarchs. Otherwise they could not prove it to those who lived 2000 yeares after them. And if there had been such miracles, the Evangelists would not have slipt them.

2. Yea, but S. Peter knew Moses and Elias at Christs transfiguration, though they were taken away from among men long before: And therefore the then living might know the dead Patriarchs and holy men raised, though they died long before. I answer, That S. Peter, and the other Apostles James and John, might know by the conference between Christ and Moses and Elias, who they were: Whereas Christ never conversed or conferred with those that were raised, for ought that is recorded, or probably to be maintained. And

it is a figment to ſay or imagine, that there was any third perſon, which knew both the then raiſed on the one ſide, and the living which never had been dead on the other ſide; or could give aſſurance that the raiſed were ſuch and ſuch Patriarchs and Fathers. Nor were their teſtimonies to be taken one for another, ſince the deniall or doubt concerning any one, draweth in the deniall or doubt of all the reſt: and upon ſuppoſall of one falſe apparition, any one and every one of the reſt might be queſtioned. Secondly, S. Peter and S. John might know Moſes and Elias by divine revelation, which to them was not unfrequent: as Chriſts Divinitie was revealed to Peter, Matth. 16.17. and Ananias his heart, Act. 5. 3, &c. or as Luke knew by the Spirit that Peter wept bitterly, though Peter wept ſecretly: for he went out firſt, Luk.22.62. and what he went out purpoſely to conceal, ſhall we think that he did purpoſely reveal? Now though the Apoſtles had ſupernall illumination guiding them into all truth; yet that by divine revelation extraordinary every one of them then living at Jeruſalem knew every one of them who were raiſed and appeared unto them, is, unneceſſarily to multiply many miracles. Now ſince *they* knew not the perſons of the raiſed by Chriſt, nor any other *third perſon*, nor by *heavenly inſtruction*; they could no way know the raiſed Patriarchs, unleſſe by their pictures or ſtatues: which of all other wayes is moſt unprobable, as being a courſe not practiſed in thoſe times and places.

The argument now hath received its anſwer. Peter might many wayes, and did ſome way know Moſes and Elias: and yet I finde not any way whereby the inhabitants of the holy citie could perſonally know the Patriarchs and Fathers, being before buried and incinerated: And therefore I probably conclude, Not any one of theſe were raiſed.

3. Secondly, my poſitive probable conjecture is this, (which alſo ſeemeth more likely to Lucas Brugenſis) That many of thoſe Saints who lived in Chriſts time, and beleeved in him; whoſe memorie was freſh, and whoſe children, kindred, or acquaintance were yet living, and who were known to adhere to Chriſt (and to this opinion Biſhop Bilſon ſeemeth ſomewhat to encline) Many (I ſay) of thoſe dead Saints now aroſe, and appeared unto many: as, it may be, John the Baptiſt (though the deceitfull miracle-mongers ſhew the falſe reliques of that good Saints head in divers places) and Zacharie and Eliſabeth his parents; and thoſe many, Luk. 1. 66. and thoſe ſhepherds, Luk.2.8. and thoſe wonderers, to whom the ſhepherds told our Saviours nativitie, Luk.2.18. perhaps ſome would adde thoſe wiſemen, who came to worſhip Chriſt, Matth.2.2. and old Simeon, and Anna the Propheteſſe, and

Joſeph

Joſeph Chriſts reputed father (though ſome think that Joſeph lived after Chriſts reſurrection: and yet others ſay, he died the twelfth yeare of Chriſts age; to whom Baronius rather inclineth: [a] *Joſeph being very aged, about 80 yeares old, when he was eſpouſed to the holieſt Virgin,* as Epiphanius and others do gueſſe. For my part, I embrace the mean, and tread in the middle path: Neither thinking that Joſeph died the 12 yeare; for when Chriſt was twelve yeares old, Joſeph went up to Jeruſalem, Luk 2. 42. and after Chriſts deſcent to Nazareth, Chriſt was obedient to Joſeph and the all-gracious Virgin, verſ. 51. therefore Joſeph could not be dead in the twelfth yeare of Chriſt; which the learned Baronius did ſupinely and ſluggiſhly paſſe over, and not obſerve: Nor yet do I imagine on the other ſide, that he lived beyond Chriſts reſurrection, or till his death; ſince there is frequent mention of Chriſts Apoſtles, of his holy mother, and of his couſins, and friends, men and women, yea of ſtrangers; and no mention, nor intimation at all, that Joſeph lived till Chriſt began publickly to preach, and do miracles; much leſſe after his death. So upon my ſuppoſall that he died between the thirteenth yeare of Chriſt and the twentie ninth, Joſeph might very well be one of thoſe who were raiſed at that time) and with him (perhaps) divers, whom Chriſt had healed, or to whom he had preached (if they died before) and many others, with whom Chriſt converſed till he was thirty yeares old.

[a] *Ad annum Chriſti* 12.

See Salianus in his Annals *in annum mundi* 4065, at large on this point.

4. And all theſe did prove and confirm unto the incredulous or wavering Saints, their friends or kindred, yea and to the very beleevers alſo, the truth of Chriſts doctrine, of his death, of his reſurrection: appearing not promiſcuouſly to Grecians or to Romans, not to all, no not to all the Jews; but *to many*; but *to fit perſons*, ſaith the Interlinearie Gloſſe, *whether Jews, Grecians, or Romans then reſiding at Jeruſalem*; to ſuch as knew them in their lives, and at their deaths. This conjecture may paſſe the more plauſibly, if we conſider that Chriſt himſelf appeared not to all indifferently, but onely to ſome, and to ſome oftner times then to others: yet no where is ſaid to have ſhewed himſelf to any, but onely to his followers and Diſciples. And as the Apoſtles were confirmed by Chriſts holy conference; ſo might many other then living beleeve, or the rather beleeve the Goſpel of Chriſt upon proof made by the new raiſed, in many particulars ſtrengthning their faith. They aroſe, [b] *To ſhew that Chriſt was raiſed,* ſaith S. Hierom on Matth. 27. [c] *They ought to riſe with Chriſt, that they might ſhew he was riſen,* ſaith Ludolphus the Carthuſian. That [d] *they ought*, ſavoureth of preſumption. Dionyſius the Carthuſian hath more moderate terms: he, on the place, ſaith, *They did teſtifie that Jeſus was the Chriſt, that he was truely riſen, and had*

[b] *Ut Dominum oſtenderent reſurgentem.*
[c] *Cum eo debebant reſurgere, ut ipſum oſtenderent reſurrexiſſe.*
[d] *Debebant.*

had deſtroyed hell. Hierom, *Tom. 3. fol.* 50. in his anſwer to the eighth queſtion of Hedibia, thus, [c] *They appeared not to all, but to many who received our Lord riſen from the dead.* And yet let me ſuperadde (by his leave) If they had appeared to the Diſciples and Apoſtles of Chriſt, who received Chriſt, I cannot think they would have concealed it.

[c] *Non omnibus apparuerunt, ſed multis qui reſurgentem Dominum ſuſceperunt.*

5. Among my other diverſions and περιεργια, or *winde-abouts*, let this be one, occaſionally ariſing from the odde poſition which Eſtius hath, in 1. Cor. 7. 39. [f] *Aquin and Carthuſian conclude rightly* (ſaith he) *from the Apoſtle, that a woman is not bound to receive her husband newly raiſed, nor may ſhe enjoy him without a new contract.* What if I anſwer, That a woman is tied to her husband as long as he liveth? but he liveth afterward, though he had been dead: and when the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of death, he ſpeaketh of a compleat death, not ſuſceptible in this world of another life. For he oppoſeth the dead man to the living: as if one could not be dead, and then living; but firſt living, and then dead for ever till the generall reſurrection. Suppoſe we Lazarus was married; had not his wife been his lawfull wife, bound to him by their firſt agreement, even after his reſurrection? I doubt it not. Yet this might be the caſe of ſome of the *many*, who were raiſed; eſpecially if they died but a while before. But I confeſſe, the caſe differeth, and is more perplexed, if the partie were dead, and the dayes of mourning paſt; and the woman married to another. Yet even here ἐπίχεα.

[f] *Rectè ex Apoſtoli verbis inferunt Aquinas & Carthuſianus, Non teneri mulierem ad recipiendum virum de morte reſuſcitatum.*

O Father moſt gracious, O Saviour moſt mercifull, O holy Spirit moſt comfortable, I humbly begge thy grace, mercie, and comfort to be ſhed forth upon me in this life; that I may pleaſe thee in my vocation, and do thy will, and fulfill the buſineſſe which thou haſt appointed for me. And leave not off (I beſeech thee) to guide me by thine enabling counſel here, till thou art readie to crown me with thy glorie in the life to come. Amen, Lord Jeſu, Amen.

CHAP.

CHAP. XV.

1. *The raiſed Saints aſcended not into heaven with Chriſt; as is proved by Scripture, and Reaſon. Suarez his ſhallow anſwer. Epiphanius ſtrengthening my former poſitive conjectures.*

2. *If the raiſed aſcended bodily into heaven, the Patriarchs ſhould not be left behinde.*

3. *The aſcending bodily of the Saints into heaven, not neceſſarie or behooffull.*

4. *Onely Chriſts bodie was ſeen aſcending.*

5. *In likelihood, Chriſt would have ſhewed the Patriarchs unto ſome of his Apoſtles.*

THat theſe raiſed Saints, who bare witneſſe of Chriſt, ſetling many pendulous and doubting ſouls, ſtrengthening many followers and Diſciples of our Saviour, and (perhaps) converting ſome unbeleevers, by teaching them that their expected Meſſiah was now come, that he did live among them, and had died for their ſinnes, and riſen again for their juſtification; That they (I ſay) after this office performed, again depoſited their bodies in the earth, and aſcended not corporally into heaven, you may behold proved by this firſt reaſon, drawn from Scripture. For Chriſt is compared to the high Prieſt, who *alone entred the* SANCTUM SANCTORUM, Hebr.9.7. It is true indeed, that we *enter into the Holieſt by the bloud of Jeſus*, Heb.10.19. but he onely, **by a new and living way, through the vail, that is to ſay, his fleſh, *entred in once into the holy place.* His entring differing from others entring; and differing in this, That with his bodie he entred, others aſcended not into heaven with him bodily. Secondly, if they had aſcended into heaven, following Chriſt; their bodies muſt have been ſeen as well as Chriſts: But their bodies were not ſeen aſcending; for the Evangeliſts would not have omitted a matter of ſuch moment. Suarez denieth this, becauſe the Evangeliſts do deſcribe ſuch things as may be ſeen with bodily eyes, in which regard, neither the Angels, nor the ſouls of Saints are reported to have accompanied him, which yet divers beleeve to have kept wing and way with him to heaven. I anſwer, Though Angels and the ſpirits of men be not ſpecified, as not being ſeen, as not being

* Hebr. 10.10.

* Hebr. 9.12.

to

to be ſeen without bodies; yet ſuch Saints as aroſe with their bodies, and went into heaven with their bodies (as Suarez and others think all they who aroſe out of their graves did) might in likelihood be ſeen aſcending with Chriſt, as well as Chriſts bodie. And their bodies were as ſubject to be ſeen with bodily eyes, as Chriſts was; yea, more viſible, by how much Chriſts bodie was more glorified then any of the Saints; if claritie, impaſſibilitie, agilitie, and ſubtilitie do make glorified bodies to be leſſe viſible: all which Chriſt had in an eminent degree above any other. An unglorified eye can ſee naturally a glorified bodie: though a glorified bodie can be ſeen or not ſeen, according as it pleaſeth. See the Supplement of Aquin, part 3. queſt. 85. artic. 2. 3. Therefore my concluſion is firm, as his objection is impertinent. Thirdly, from Epiphanius in Ancorato, I gathered what before I onely conjectured, That ſuch onely were raiſed as died a while before, who riſing were known to ſuch as then lived, that their teſtimonie might, by their former familiaritie, the rather be beleeved, and be void of exception; whereas if ſuch were raiſed as died long before, they muſt firſt uſe arguments to prove that themſelues had ſometimes lived, and that they once died, that they were newly raiſed, and that they were the ſame perſons whom they reported themſelves to be.

2. Now, that theſe ſhould go into eternall happineſſe both of ſouls and bodies, and leave the Patriarchs bodies in the duſt, is in judgement improbable. Therefore if it were to be proved, that thoſe who aroſe out of their graves after or upon Chriſts Paſſion, did aſcend into the moſt glorious happineſſe in heaven, both of bodie and ſoul: as, above other men, I ſhould think and maintain, that Adam, Seth, Noah, Abraham, Iſaac, and all the reſt before mentioned, and others unmentioned, holy Prophets and others, were they that did ariſe, and were they who were partakers with Chriſt of perfect immortalitie, and had more favours and priviledges then other men: So ſince Epiphanius concludeth, That others of later times were raiſed; I will be bold to inferre, that others aſcended not into heaven before thoſe holy Patriarchs, but laid their bodies in the graves again.

3. Again, if the end of their reſurrection mho now aroſe, was to teſtifie that Chriſt was riſen; this dutie they might fulfill, though they aſcended not into heaven with him. If to teſtifie that Jeſus was *the Chriſt*, that he was *juſt*, that he was *the Sonne of God* (which was the collection of the Centurion, when he ſaw the graves open, and that many bodies aroſe, Matth. 27. 54.) their aſcenſion into heaven was not neceſſary to that certificate. If they ſay, They aroſe to be witneſſes of his aſcenſion into heaven: I anſwer, He had many

other witneſſes of it, Act. 1. 9. who would have been witneſſes of their aſcenſion alſo, if they had aſcended with him. If you ſay, they aroſe to be companions of his aſcenſion; I reply, that you do but beg the queſtion, and hold a groundleſſe concluſion.

4. Moreover, *Chriſt was ſeen of the Apoſtles fourtie dayes, and ſpake of things pertaining to the Kingdome of God*, Act. 1. 3. and *He ſhewed himſelf alive after his Paſſion, by many infallible proofs*, as is ſaid immediately before: and they ſaw, when he aſcended into heaven, verſ. 9. But that Chriſt ever converſed with any of thoſe that were raiſed; or was ſeen with them; or they with him; or they with the Apoſtles, or Diſciples; or that any aſcended into heaven, is no direct mention; as perhaps there would, if Adam and the reſt of the holy Patriarchs and Prophets had been raiſed, and had gone into heaven.

5. Neither would Chriſt, who vouchſafed Peter, James, and John, to ſee him conferre with Moſes and Elias at the Transfiguration, have now denied Peter, James, and John, to ſee him conferre with the ſame Moſes and other Patriarchs after his reſurrection, if they had aroſe and conferred with him, as out of doubt, during the time of fourtie dayes that he converſed on earth, ſince their and his reſurrection (if they aroſe) he often diſcourſed with them: for he did but about twelve times appeare to the Apoſtles, and that moſt on the Sabbath-dayes and then ſtayed not very long with them: and ſo I may probably think that he did imploy ſome part of the reſt of the time from his reſurrection to his aſcenſion, in conference with Moſes and the Patriarchs raiſed; eſpecially if they were to aſcend bodily into heaven with him: But none of theſe things are once pointed at: Therefore there is no likelihood that they were raiſed, much leſſe that they aſcended with Chriſt into heaven.

O Glorious Saviour of mankinde, who didſt aſcend bodily into heaven, to prepare a place for us amongſt thoſe many manſions filled with bliſſe, Open the gate to me who do knock, bid me enter into my maſters joy; that I may praiſe thy name, and wait on thee my onely ſtay, my delight, and the life of my ſoul, my Lord and Redeemer Jeſus Chriſt. So be it.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVI.

1. *Angels taken for men. Angels repreſenting men, are called men.*

2. The name JEHOVAH aſcribed to an Angel repreſenting JEHOVAH, *ſay Eſtius and Thyræus. Picking of faults in the Apocryphall Scriptures, to be abhorred.*

3. *Druſius his povertie. The Apocrypha is too little eſteemed. The Angel, who guided young Tobie, defended.*

4. *The great difference between Chriſts manner of riſing, and Lazarus his.*

INdeed it is ſaid, Act. 1. 10. Ἰδοὺ, ἄνδρες δύο, &c. *Behold, two men ſtood by them in white apparel*, whiles the Apoſtles were looking ſtedfaſtly into heaven after Chriſt; and they told them of his coming to the laſt judgement in the ſame manner as he aſcended. Which two, certainly, might be men, and *were men*, ſaith the Text; yea (ſay ſome Expoſitors) *were ſome of thoſe Many, who aroſe out of their graves after Chriſts reſurrection.* Theſe were *amicti veſtibus albis*, ſaith Eraſmus: *In albo veſtitu*, ſaith Beza: Now, the Saints are *arayed in white robes*, Revel. 7. 13. and whiteneſſe of garments is a token of joy, Eccleſiaſtes 9. 7, 8. and theſe had cauſe to joy. I firſt anſwer, with moſt of the Ancients, with the modern Beza, Sa, Montanus, and Sanctius, That theſe two men, ſo called, were Angels. For the Angels repreſenting mens perſons, are called according to their names or titles whom they repreſent. As in the viſion which S. Paul ſaw by night, Act. 16. 9. it is ſaid, Ἀνήρ τις ἦν Μακεδών, *There ſtood a man of Macedonia, &c.* Now cleare it is, this was not a Macedonian indeed; but an Angel bearing his perſon, in the ſhape of man calling him with the call of God: and what is ſaid in truth of ſtorie, Joh. 20. 12. *Marie ſeeth two Angels in white, ſitting, the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the bodie of Jeſus had layen*, is ſaid by repreſentation, Luk. 24. 4. *Two men ſtood by them in ſhining garments*; they took on them the ſhapes of two men, and ſtood in their places.

2. *If Angels repreſent the perſon of God, and do things, or ſay things as from him, and as for himſelf; they are called Gods, and the very name of JEHOVA is attributed to them: as the Angel appearing in the fierie buſh to Moſes; and other Angels*, ſaith [a] Thyræus, and [b] Eſtius. In the New Teſtament, another Angel

[a] *De locis infeſtis, part. 1. cap 23.*
[b] *Sentent. 2. Diſtinct. 8. Paragr. 8.*

gel is called *Alpha and Omega*, Revel. 22.13. which were blaſphemie for any Angel to ſay or uſurp, if the Repreſenter might not be ſtyled according to the dignitie of the Repreſented. Which note I have the rather inſiſted upon, to laſh the raſh cenſure of ſuch, who, under pretence to keep the Canonicall Scripture at a great diſtance from the Apocryphall, pick unneceſſarie faults in the Apocryphall: ſuch faults, and ſo ſmall, as a man not prepoſſeſſed could not ſee, and a naturall rationall Philoſopher would eſteem but little, in compariſon of greater doubts in ſemblance, ariſing from our undoubted Canonicall. S. Hierom was the firſt that ſtyled them *Apocrypha*, who never left any thing objected againſt him unanſwered: yet being therefore taxed by Ruffinus, that therein he had robbed the holy Ghoſt of his treaſure, he made no reply. Thus ſome have been hurt with kiſſing, and the tenderneſſe of the ape killeth thoſe young ones whom ſhe loveth beſt. And whileſt they play the Criticks in cenſuring the Apocrypha, they breed irreverence and irreligion toward the Canonicall, by how much the doubts ſeem more, or greater; *ſeem*, but *are not*.

3. The moſt painfull and learned John Druſius, in his epiſtle to Joſeph Scaliger; before his Commentarie on the firſt book of the Maccabees, intimateth his fear of want, even of things neceſſarie; and, in the very end of his caſtigations on Eccleſiaſticus, prayeth to God to ſtirre up the hearts of the Great ones and illuſtrious Lords to help him (may heaven and earth take notice, how miſerable the eſtate of the learned is; when tithes the fixed honourary of the Prieſthood by Divine right, are uſurped by the Laicks; and reward is meaſured not by true worth, or by the meaſure of the Sanctuarie, which was full, running over, and double to the common and profane meaſures; but by the ignorant eſtimate of niggardly mechanicks, their under agents:) yet he brake through all difficulties, and hath beſtowed great pains in his notes on both theſe books. Scaliger, *de emendat. tempor. lib.* 5. ſaith, The firſt book of the Maccabees is [c] *An excellent work*. Again, [d] *You knew long ſince full well the great worth of this book*, ſaith he, in his epiſtle to Druſius. And Albericus Gentilis moſt exquiſitely diſputeth in defence of the firſt book of Maccabees (ſo little regarded in theſe times) and anſwereth every objection which is brought againſt it. I could ſay more in defence of other books Apocryphall; but I recall my ſelf to handle that particular which cauſed this diverſion. How many wide mouths have been made? how many ſcandalls taken? how many aſperſions of horrible untruth and lying have been faſtened on that bleſſed Angel who guided Tobias the younger in his long and dangerous journey, becauſe he ſaid, (though he gave old Tobit a nick, for that he would enquire his name,

[c] *Opus eximium.*
[d] *Tu præſtantiam hujus libri jamdudum ſcis.*

immediately after) Tob.5. 12. *I am Azarias, the ſonne of Ananias the Great, and of thy brethren*; whereas you may expound the words by this rule, That he who ſuſtains anothers perſon, may call himſelf, or be called according as the perſon himſelf. As the Angel, who appeared to S. John, Rev.22.9. ſaying, *I am thy fellow ſervant, and of thy brethren the Prophets*; and, perhaps, took one of their ſhapes at that time. Likewiſe in the undoubted Canonicall, the Angel Gabriel is called *The man Gabriel*, Dan.9.21. becauſe he appeared in the ſimilitude of a man. Thus may the place of Tobit be expounded: and, without ſuch favourable interpretations, *Familiaris & quotidianus ſermo non cohærebit*, ſaith Cicero, *Pro A. Cæcinna.* Secondly, you may expound the words thus, I AM AZARIAS, that is, *the help of God:* THE SONNE OF ANANIAS THE GREAT; Now ANANIAS ſignifieth *the grace*, or *the gift of God.* And this is verified by the actions of the Angel, who helped indeed both the Tobiahs, by the eſpeciall *grace of God.* Adde to this, that the Angels true name was *Raphael*, Tob. 12. 15. which is by ſignification, *the medicine*, or *phyſick of God:* as indeed he did make whole young Tobie his wife, and healed alſo old Tobie, Tob. 12.3. All which being laid together, remove all inconvenience from the words, if we ſay, The Angel by thoſe names of men, *Azarias* and *Ananias*, did ſignifie, that the help which was to come from him to them, came to him from God. For even this way draweth nigh unto that *Lexicall expoſition*, as [d] Sixtus Senenſis phraſeth it; which I will not wholly exclude.

[d] *Bibliothecæ ſanct.3.*

Secondly I anſwer, If theſe were no Angels, but very men; and theſe ſome of thoſe *Many* who aroſe out of their ſepulchres: yet cleare it is, they aſcended not with Chriſt, nor aſcended they at all, for ought that can be gathered; but upon the performance of this their laſt errand, their bodies might again embrace the duſt.

4. Laſtly, this may have a place of a probable argument: As Elias, when he was rapt into heaven in a fiery chariot, by a whirlwinde, (being even therein a type of the reſurrection) let fall his mantle from him, 2. King. 2. 13. perchance as a token that he needed it no more: ſo Chriſt, when he raiſed himſelf, left his grave-linen in the grave, the linen clothes by themſelves, the napkin that was about his head wrapped together in a place by it ſelf, John 20. 7. out of doubt, to ſhew that death ſhould have no more dominion over him. In which regard alſo he aroſe, the tombe being ſhut, and the tombe-ſtone ſealed, and obſerved narrowly with a watch: for the removing of the tombe-ſtone by the Angel, was not to help Chriſt to ariſe, who entred in to his diſciples, *januis clauſis, the doores being ſhut*, and came forth

of

of the grave, *ſepulchro ſignato, the monument being ſealed:* but that the women might go in, and ſee that Chriſt was before raiſed, Mark 16. 3. &c. (and *the ſtone was not rolled away propter Chriſtum, ſed propter mulieres, for Chriſt, but for the women,* ſaith Hierom *ad Hedibiam)* whereas contrarily, when Lazarus was raiſed, the tombe-ſtone was firſt removed, and Lazarus aroſe, tied with the grave-clothes; and *his face bound with a napkin:* yea, *came forth bound hand and foot with grave-clothes,* Joh. 11. 44. by a new miracle, walking being bound, and bound with grave-clothes; to ſhew, that though he did live, he did live to die again. In which reſpect alſo, perhaps, the graves were opened at Chriſts paſſion, when he yeelded up the ghoſt; and continued open till his reſurrection (yea, till the ends of their riſing were fulfilled:) and after his reſurrection, *many bodies of Saints which ſlept aroſe, and came out of the graves,* Matth. 27. 52, 53.

O Bleſſed Lord God, who haſt commanded that we ſhall not adde to thy Word, nor yet take from it, Grant (I beſeech thee) that I may neither think thy certain true Scriptures to be doubtfull, nor the uncertain to be Canonicall: but poſſeſſe me with awfull and reverent thoughts concerning thy holy writ, that I adoring the fulneſſe thereof, may avoid all haſtie, ſupine, forced, and uncharitable expoſitions, and fetch my little light, and candle of knowledge, from that firſt ſhine, and prime rayes of thee the onely Light, my Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt. Amen.

CHAP. XVII.

1. *The place of Matth. 27. 53. is diverſly pointed; and, according to the pointing, is the diverſitie of meaning. The firſt implieth, that the Saints aroſe with Chriſt, though their graves were opened before. This interpretation is not ſo likely, though received generally.*

2. *The ſecond inferreth, that they aroſe before Chriſt, though they went not into the citie, till after his reſurrection. This is favoured by the Syriack, and is more agreeable to reaſon.*

3. *That the raiſed Saints died again, proved by reaſons,* and Hebr. 11. 40.

4. *Chriſt the firſt-fruits of the dead, and of the raiſed. Angelicall aſſumed bodies were ſeen and heard; much rather ſhould mens bodies aſcending with Chriſt.*

5. *S. Auguſtine, Aquinas, Hierom, Chryſoſtom, Theophylact, Euthymius, Proſper, Soto, Salmeron, Barradius, Pererius, Valentian, affirm that the raiſed Saints died again. Franciſcus Lucas Brugenſis holds it likely.*

THoſe laſt cited words of Matth. 27. 53. being differently pointed, will bear a double and different interpretation. Our late Tranſlation hath it thus, *The Saints came out of the graves after his reſurrection,* (there is one pauſe) *and went into the holy citie,* (there is another pauſe:) ſo is it in the Vulgat, and in moſt Greek copies. This ſenſe in thoſe words is involved, That the Saints aroſe not till Chriſt aroſe, and that their reſurrection was a little after, or almoſt contemporary with Chriſts: which alſo is evidently foretold, Iſaiah 26. 19. (if the prophet propheſieth there of Chriſt, or ſpeaketh in Chriſts perſon) *Thy dead men ſhall live; together with my dead bodie ſhall they ariſe, &c.* For Chriſts bodie ariſeth not from the earth at the generall reſurrection; and therefore they punctually ſigne out the reſurrection of other Saints with Chriſt, and with his dead bodie. But if Iſaiah ſpeaketh of his own reſurrection, and not of Chriſts; nor in Chriſts perſon, but in his own: by theſe words and the words following he pointeth out the generall reſurrection: and ſo Vatablus, Hierom and Lyra expound the place. Now, if he point at the laſt day of the world, the argument is demonſtrative, that either Iſaiah aroſe not with Chriſt (though he was the moſt Evangelicall Prophet, and in no likelihood to be ſecluded from thoſe benefits, which other Prophets are ſaid to enjoy:) or if he aroſe, that he died again to riſe with others at the day of judgement; which they who aſcended bodily into heaven, did not: Therefore Iſaiah is not bodily aſcended into heaven; and if not he, why others?

2. The ſecond way of pointing that place of S. Matthew, is this; *Many bodies of the Saints aroſe:* (there is one Colon) καὶ ἐξελθόντες ἐκ τῶν μνημείων μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῦ εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν *and coming out of the graves after his reſurrection went into the holy citie.* there is the full period, and no other pointing of the words. And thus it is read in the edition printed at Geneva by John Vignon, 1615. and illuſtrated with Caſaubon his notes: but I take it, that a pauſe ſhould be immediately

diately after the word *Graves:* and then they might ariſe before Chriſt; but not enter into the holy citie till after his reſurrection. I am ſure, the Syriack, tranſlated by Tremellius, thus readeth and pointeth it; and Lucas Brugenſis diſliketh it not; [a] *And they came forth, and after his reſurrection went into the holy citie.* In the Syriack you have theſe ſteps, *Obdormierant; ſurrexerunt; egreſsi ſunt; & poſt reſurrectionem ejus ingreſsi ſunt in urbem.* From which ſecond reading the reſultance is, That thoſe Saints aroſe before Chriſt aroſe. Neither is it againſt reaſon: for at Chriſts paſsion *the graves were opened,* verſ. 52. Shall the graves be opened, and nothing be raiſed? No: for it is added immediately, *Many bodies of Saints were raiſed.* Shall the bodies be raiſed; and either lie down, or ſit ſtill in the graves? To what end? *Many bodies aroſe of the Saints, which* HAD SLEPT; Κεκοιμημένων. It is in the preterperfect tenſe; Now were they waked, now were they raiſed, now went they forth out of their monuments: and between the time of Chriſts paſsion and his reſurrection, perhaps, the raiſed conferred with themſelves; perchance, they communed with others without the citie; or, being rapt with divine ſpeculations, might either on mount Olivet, or rather on mount Calvarie, ſpend that time in ſolitary devotions, expecting the triumphant return of their captain Jeſus Chriſt from hell and the grave; and after his reſurrection they came into the holy citie.

[a] *Et egreſsi ſunt, & poſt reſurrectionem ejus ingreſsi ſunt in urbem ſanctam.*

3. The ſumme is, Theſe reliving Saints aroſe at Chriſts paſsion, and before him; but none ever aroſe before him unto an eternall reſurrection: for in that regard Chriſt was *the firſt fruits of them that ſlept,* 1. Corin. 15. 20. and it is Chriſts priviledge, which the Apoſtle toucheth at, Rom. 6. 9. *That Chriſt being raiſed from the dead, dieth no more, death hath no more dominion over him:* (of which hereafter, though I have ſpoken of it alſo before) Death had power over others, who were raiſed before him: Therefore they aſcended not into heaven with their bodies; nor were partakers of the eternall incorruption and immortalitie. Let me adde, That as the ſepulchres were opened, that they might come forth; and continued open till the reſurrection, and perhaps after: ſo in that they were opened to their hand, and did not ſhut again, I take it as a figure, that they did (as it were) expect the return of their bodies; and as a probable argument, that they did lie down again in their old repoſitories, or dormitories. And that you may the ſooner give credit unto this, in the next place conſider the generall law, That all of us ſhall have glorie and immortalitie together; for Hebr. 11. 40. *God hath prepared a better thing for us, that they without us ſhould not be made perfect.* If you expound this of the Fathers

of the Old Teſtament, and of the *ſtola animæ, the robe of honour for the minde*; yet you ſhall finde Revel. 6. 11, that in regard even of *ſtola corporis, the glorious garment of the bodie*, the Saints themſelves are commanded to *reſt yet for a little ſeaſon, untill their fellow-ſervants alſo, and their brethren* (either then alive, or perchance not then born) *that ſhould be killed as they were, ſhould be fulfilled.*

Now againſt this generall rule you muſt not make a particular exception, without expreſſe warrant from the word of God: But there is no teſtimony at all from the word of God, either direct or inferentiall, that any of thoſe *Many* who aroſe, aroſe to glorie or immortalitie, or aſcended into heaven: Therefore we may boldly conclude, They died again. This argument is of ſuch force, that Suarez leaveth it unanſwered, and untouched. Laſtly, if the bodies of theſe Saints aſcended into heaven; either they aſcended after Chriſt, or before him, or with him. If after him; When and how long after? and why after him? They aſcended not preſently after him: for the Apoſtles who looked ſtedfaſtly toward heaven, even after he was taken out of their ſight, might have then perceived their bodily aſcent. If you ſay, So ſoon as the Apoſtles left their ſerious viewing, and hearkened unto the Angels, then they aſcended: I anſwer; I would ſay ſo alſo, if I ſaw any proof, or if I could think that God ſent the Angels juſt at that moment, to hinder the Apoſtles from ſeeing the Saints mount up to heaven, which would have been ſo joyous a ſight. Briefly, there is no reaſon to ſay they aſcended long after Chriſt aſcended; and certainly leſſe reaſon is there to think they aſcended before him.

4. Moreover, Chriſt as man ſhall be Judge at the laſt day: and God hath given aſſurance of it to all men, *in that he hath raiſed him from the dead*, Act. 17. 31. If any other were raiſed up in the ſame manner before him, or with him, to an eternall reſurrection; what aſſurance doth God give by this place of S. Paul, that Chriſt ſhall be the Judge, rather then others? But indeed the raiſing of Chriſt was more then ordinary, was more then temporarie: Let him have the preeminence in all things: *Chriſt is the firſt-fruits of them that ſlept*, 1. Cor. 15. 20. *The firſt-fruits of them that are raiſed*, verſ. 23. He is *Primitiæ mortuorum*, Revel. 1. 5. *& reſurgentium*, Act. 26. 23. Chriſt is the firſt who ſhall ariſe from the dead, *viz.* to an eternall reſurrection: his bodie opening, as it were, the gates of heaven for our bodies; which if Enoch and Elias did by priviledge eſpeciall anticipate (though theſe were not properly raiſed, but rather taken up;) yet, if more, if ſo many ſhould before him ariſe to an everlaſting reſurrection; it deſtroyeth the nature of a generall rule. [b] *Grace given alike to all, is no longer grace*

[b] *Gratia quæ omnibus datur, non eſt gratia, ſed natura; & privilegium gaudet paucitate.*

grace but nature: and a priviledge is properly confined to a few. That they aſcended not with Chriſt, I proved before: and for a Corollarie do repeat this, That if aſſumed and Angelicall bodies were to be ſeen, and were ſeen and heard at Chriſts aſcenſion; out of doubt the bodies of Saints had been viſible, yea ſeen, if they had then aſcended.

5. If any deſire to ſee more reaſons, let him reade S. Auguſtine, *Epiſt. 99. ad Euodium; & de Mirabilibus Sacræ Scripturæ*; whoſe reaſons [c] Aquinas preferreth, and ſubſcribeth unto.

[c] *In tertia parte Summæ, quæſt. 53. artic. 3.*

You may now perceive that I am gently fallen upon the ſecond head; in vertue of which I undertook to prove, That the Saints, who miraculouſly aroſe, and here aroſe, did not aſcend into heaven, but died again: for the ſecond head, was Authoritie. Among Authours you have alreadie two of the chiefeſt for depth of learning, Auguſtine and Aquinas. Hierom is of their minde, on Matth. 27. Chryſoſtom, Hom. 89. on Matth. compareth thoſe Saints reſurrection unto Lazarus his riſing to a mortall life; though Beza directly contradicteth it. The ſame Hierom, *Epiſt. 150. ad Hedibiam*, again confirms it. To the ſame purpoſe, Theophylact on the place, and Euthymius, chap. 67. on Matth. ſo Proſper in his book *de promiſſionibus & prædictionibus Dei.* In the middle ſchool, you have Soto, *in 4. lib. Sentent. Diſtinct. 43. quæſt. 2. artic. 1.* Yea, even among Jeſuites, Salmeron and Barradius are on this ſide; and Pererius on the 6 chapter of the Revelation, Diſput. 24. and Gregorie Valentian, *Tom. 4. Diſput. 2. Quæſt. 5.* where he ſleighteth Cajetans arguments, and ſaith that our is the more probable opinion, and that Aquin, from Auguſtine, doth moſt excellently confirm it. In the laſt place cometh that learned Franciſcus Lucas Brugenſis, who having ſet down the ends why theſe *Many* were raiſed (to wit, To be *præcones, criers,* or *trumpetters* of Chriſts reſurrection, which was experimentally evidenced by their own; and that Jeſus was that Saviour, and that he ought thus to ſuffer, and thus to enter into his glorie) cloſeth in theſe words, [d] *When they had performed this duty, it is likely that they ſlept again, and reſted in their ſepulchres like Moſes.* Yea, ſay I, much rather did they ſleep in their graves, then Moſes: for though he was buried, yet being raiſed, he appeared in glorie, Luk. 9. 31. which apparition being in bodie principally (for his ſoul was not ſeen) we may not imagine, that a glorified bodie is ſo ſubject to corruption, or a ſecond dying: which Brugenſis himſelf will not ſay of theſe raiſed *Many*; for he hath an odde crotchet, and ſingular conceit, That thoſe *Many* were raiſed, neither to an immortall, nor to a mortall life; but to a middle and mean betwixt both; not to a perpetuall one, nor yet to a terrene life; but heavenly, without the uſe of meats or drinks, without fear or pain of death.

[d] *Hoc officio quando iſti defuncti fuerant, veriſimile eſt eos iterum dormiviſſe, & in ſepulchris ſuis quieviſſe, quemadmodum Moſes.*

O Fountain of mercie inexhauſtible, ſweet Jeſu, who being the Sonne of God, *didſt become* Man, *that we the ſonnes of* Men, *might be the ſonnes of* God; *who didſt* die, *that we might* live; *ſuffering for our ſinnes, and riſing again for our juſtification; Have mercie, O, have mercie upon me; paſſe by my tranſgreſſions, I beſeech thee, and preſent me blameleſſe to the Throne of Grace, for thine own merit ſake: to which I aſcribe all power, and from which I expect all my glorie. So be it.*

CHAP. XVIII.

1. *The arguments of the contrary opinion anſwered. Suarez, and eſpecially Cajetan, cenſured.*

2. *That by the* holy Citie, *Jeruſalem below was meant, proved at large. Joſephus and the Jews erring about the name of Jeruſalem.* Hierom *uncertain.*

3. *How the raiſed appeared. A difference between appearing as men, and appearing as newly raiſed men. Franciſcus Lucas Brugenſis rejected.*

4. *An argument of Maldonat anſwered by the prodigious Legend of Chriſtina, who died twice. No hurt is to man, if God will ſend his ſoul from an heavenly place, to live a while on earth again.*

5. *No harm to die twice. The difference between death* compleat *and* incompleat.

6. *God can diſpenſe with his own Laws.*

THus having beaten down the oppoſite authorities (if they were fully on that ſide) with weight and number; the third and laſt point, which I propounded to handle, was the anſwering of all their reaſons and arguments. Some are ſo weak, that I need not to anſwer. For Suarez himſelf, who alledgeth them, confeſſeth their weakneſſe, and anſwereth them. Theſe three proofs following he alledgeth; but anſwereth not. Firſt, *It was decent and behovefull,* DECUIT (ſaith Suarez) *that Chriſt, who had both bodie and ſoul, ſhould have companions of his glory, in their bodies as well as in their*

their ſouls: For his delight is to be with the children of men, Proverb. 8. 31. Which Suarez (it may be) took as an hint from Cajetan: for he, on Aquin. *parte primâ, queſt.* 53. *art.* 3. hath it thus, [a] *It ſtandeth with reaſon, that they aroſe perfectly to a life fully immortall, that the bodily bleſſedneſſe of Chriſt might have ſome fellows: For the bodily happineſſe ſeems not perfect and compleat, if bodily ſocietie and company be wanting: for man is, according to the corporeall life, a ſociable creature*, or *good fellow: not onely for want of neceſſaries unto life, as happeneth in this world; but for naturall delight, conſiſting in bodily converſation*, ſaith Cajetan, diſſenting in this from the great Summiſt his maſter. I anſwer, that Cajetans argument is ridiculous: for it holdeth chiefly in children, or babies, in fools and in ſtriplings, who love play-mates; or in worldly factours, whom buſineſſe forceth into ſocietie and commerce. But that the Saints in heaven, yea Chriſt himſelf, the all bleſſed Saviour of the world, both God and Man, ſhould not have the full of delight, or have too little of bodily felicity, if other humane bodies be not preſent, favoureth rather of the Turkiſh Coran and the Arabian ſchool, then of the ſacred Text: and that Chriſt in heaven, is *animal ſociale*, naturally delighting in bodily converſation (for ſo much the application of that Axiom importeth, or els he ſaith nothing to the purpoſe) doth imply his brutiſh conceit of our moſt holy Redeemer. The ſweet ſinger of Iſrael ſaith, Pſal. 16. 11. *In thy preſence is fulneſſe of joy, at thy right hand are pleaſures for evermore.* If this befall other holy Saints; much more it belongeth to Chriſt, from whoſe fulneſſe all the whole bodie of his Church receiveth comfortable influences. But grant we, that ſuch bodily companie might be deſired by Chriſt: yet he needed not theſe *Many*; but he might have had Enoch and Elias, or Moſes and Elias, with whom he conferred at his tranſfiguration.

[a] *Rationale videtur, quòd ſurrexerint perfectè ad vitam penitus immortalem; ut beatitudo corporis in Chriſto haberet ſocios: minus enim corporalis felicitas aliquid habere videretur, ſi deſit corporalis ſocietas: eſt enim homo ſecundùm vitam corpoream animal ſociale, &c.*

Secondly, unto Suarez his words Barradas his fellow-Jeſuite anſwereth, Chriſt needeth not men indued with bodies now in heaven. As for the place of the Proverbs, the precedent words give light unto them, *I rejoyced in the habitable parts of the earth*, ſaith the Text: So his delights were with the ſonnes of men in and upon the earth: but of his delight in them with their humane bodies in heaven before the laſt reſurrection, there is no inkling or intimation given. Suarez argueth thus ſecondly, [b] *It is very naturall for a glorified ſoul to be united unto an immortall and glorious bodie: But their ſouls were glorious: Therefore their bodies alſo: And the glorie of a bleſſed ſoul, of its own nature redounds upon the bodie.* I anſwer, It doth ſo naturally, if it be not hindered. But the

[b] *Anima glorioſa connaturale eſt, &c.*

the bleſſed ſouls of theſe *Many Saints* were in bodies, not immortall, not bleſſed, not glorious, for a few dayes or houres, and that *by miracle*, ſaith Barradius.

Beſides, whileſt Chriſt lived on earth, unleſſe at his Tranſfiguration, or ſome ſuch eſpeciall occaſion, the glorie of his moſt happie ſoul, which was then beatified as much as any of the ſouls of the Saints are now, and more, did not impart viſible glorie to his bodie: but it was paſſible and mortall, for it died. Then why may not theſe Saints have the glorious light of their ſouls eclipſed from their bodies?

Again, the aſſumed bodies of bleſſed Angels ever did reſolve into their firſt principles, when the ends why they aſſumed them, were fulfilled: the like might be in the Saints, whoſe ſouls were hindered from communicating incorruptible and glorious qualities to their bodies; and ſo they were partakers not of the perfection of the laſt eternall reſurrection, but of the imperfections incident to the temporarie and mortall reſurrection.

Thirdly, ſaith Suarez, *Corah, Dathan, and Abiram, are in hell with their bodies: therefore ſome, to ſhew Gods mercie, muſt now be in heaven with their bodies: and therefore theſe Many.* I anſwer, that both the ſequences are lame, though we ſhould grant the ground or antecedent of the Argument. For firſt, was not Gods mercie ſeen in heaven, from the houre of Corah and his companies deſcent into hell, till theſe *Many* aſcended? Then why may it not ſtill be ſeen, though theſe aſcended not? eſpecially, ſince that Chriſt is there in a moſt bleſſed incorruptible bodie, as they are in hell in curſed bodies, which would take corruption for a favour. Laſtly, why muſt theſe *Many Saints* be the counter-pattern in heaven, rather then Enoch, or Elias, or Moſes, being the Magiſtrate againſt whom Corah and his complices combined themſelves?

2. Others there are who object, *It is ſaid*, THEY ENTRED INTO THE HOLY CITIE: *But the holy citie is the new Jeruſalem, Jeruſalem above, Revel.* 21. 2. *Therefore they died not, but went into heaven.* I anſwer, Jeruſalem below, the materiall Jeruſalem, the ſeat of the kings of Judah, becauſe of Gods worſhip there eſpecially to be performed in that glorious Temple, was alſo called *the holy citie.* GLORIOUS THINGS ARE SPOKEN OF THEE, THOU CITIE OF GOD, Pſal. 87. 3. Amongſt others, thou art ſtyled *holy.* Rev. 11. 2. *The holy citie ſhall the Gentiles tread under foot:* but the Gentiles ſhall never trample on the new Jeruſalem above. On the one ſide of a ſhekel of the Sanctuarie, which once I ſaw, was ſtamped in Hebrew characters, *Holy Jeruſalem.* Again, Tobit. 13. 9. *O Jeruſalem, the holy citie, he will ſcourge thee:* but he will never ſcourge Jeruſalem above, which is the Mother

of

of us all: therefore Jeruſalem below muſt needs be this *holy Citie.*

Bellarmine himſelf, *de Pontifice Romano*, 3. 13. accordeth with us, and interpreteth the ſtrife of the two Witneſſes againſt Antichriſt, in Jeruſalem below. And before him, Hierom in his anſwer to the eighth queſtion of Hedibia, *Tom.* 3. *fol.* 50. ſaith, *Of theſe words*, THE SAINTS ENTRED INTO THE HOLY CITIE, *we muſt take* THE HOLY CITIE *to be Jeruſalem;*[b] *to diſtinguiſh that citie from other cities, all which did then give themſelves to idolatrie*: applying it to the materiall Jeruſalem, *which* (ſaith he) *from the time of Veſpaſian and Titus, was no more called* THE HOLY CITIE.

[b] *Ad diſtinctionem omnium civitatum, quæ tunc idolis ſervichant.*

Moreover, Paula and Euſtochium, or rather Hierom in their names, *ad Marcellam*, *Tom.* 1. *fol.* 59. citing the place of *Many Saints &c.* adde remarkably, [c] *You muſt not preſently underſtand the celeſtiall Jeruſalem, as moſt have ridiculouſly interpreted this place; when it could be no ſigne nor token among men on earth, if the bodies of the Saints were ſeen in the heavenly Jeruſalem.*

[c] *Nec ſtatim Hierosolyma cœleſtis, ſicut plerique ridiculè interpretantur, in hoc loco intelligitur: cùm ſignum nullum eſſe potuerit apud homines, ſi corpora Sanctorum in cœleſti Jeruſalem viſa ſunt.*

May I annex to this, That, if the whole land of Jurie be to this day called *The holy Land*, nor will have other eſtimate of divers Nations, in ſome regards, till the worlds end: then certainly the Metropoliticall citie thereof, the famous and eminent Jeruſalem, might in thoſe dayes be dignified with the title of *The holy citie*, for many juſt regardable cauſes.

Again, when it is ſaid, Act. 6. 13. *This man ceaſeth not to ſpeak blaſphemous words againſt this holy place*; they that ſaid ſo, were not in the *Temple*; but in their *Councel-houſe* in *the citie*: and the words have a true reference to the *citie*, as well as to the *Temple*; yea more, becauſe the Temple was within the citie, and not *è contrá*. Now their Councel-houſe was diſtant a good way from any part of the Temple, and was built cloſe by one wall of the citie; and was called GASITH in Hebrew; wherein ſeventie Senatours, or ordinarie Judges, called SANHEDRIM, determined weighty cauſes: and here they examined the Apoſtles, Acts 4. 7. and S. Stephen, Act. 6. 13. and 7. 1.

The citie which before was called *Solyma*, was by Melchizedech named *Hieroſolyma*, that is, *The holy Solyma*, ſaith Joſephus, *de bello Judaico*. 7. 18. Let Joſephus juſtifie upon what grounds he mongrelleth the name: for, neither did Melchizedech ſpeak Greek; nor doth the Hebrew incline to that ſenſe: yet is even that hotch-potch better to be digeſted, then the impious and ſottiſh fable of other Jews, That Melchizedech having named the citie *Salem*, and Abraham having called the mount Moriah in or about Jeruſalem, JEHOVA JIREH, *The Lord will ſee*, or *provide*, Geneſ. 22. 14: God him-

himſelf being unwilling to ſuffer a debate between the holy Melchizedech and Abraham the father of the faithfull, umpired the buſineſſe, and of both their attributes, or appellations, compounded one word, or name, and calleth it thereafter, *Hieruſalem.*

Perhaps, S. Hierom can hardly prove what he ſaith in his epiſtle to Dardanus, *de Terra promiſſionis Tom.* 3. 24. that the citie was firſt called *Jebus*; and thencefrom *Jeruſalem*, rather then *Jebuſalem, Euphoniæ gratiâ, that it might have a fair ſound and good pronunciation.* For there is mention of Jeruſalem, Judg. 1. 8. yea before that, Joſh. 10. 3. long before David expelled the Jebuſites: and in the dayes of Melchizedech, it was called *Salem:* for Melchizedech was *King of Salem*, Hebr. 7. 1. Now that the Jebuſites inhabited Jeruſalem before the time of Melchizedech, or that he ſhould be King of the Jebuſites inhabiting that place, or that he ſhould expell the Jebuſites there commorant before him, or how they repoſſeſſed it till Davids time, or indeed that the name was given as S. Hierom opineth, are matters onely of conjecture, as not being backt with proofs ſufficient.

Laſtly, if we be led with reaſon, as I ſaid before, What ſhould be the end of theſe Saints aſcending to heaven? Chriſt had no need of bodily ſervice; and we may not think that they were to bear witneſſe in heaven of Chriſts reſurrection: for the triumphant Saints need no ſuch proof, or witneſſes; their beatificall viſion and fruition exempteth them from doubting. The living had more need to know by theſe *Many*, the reſurrection of Chriſt: but by them the living knew nothing at all, ſo farre as can be proved; if this going into the holy citie be to be interpreted of the ſupernall Jeruſalem. But that the words are to be expounded of Jeruſalem below, the paſſage immediately following demonſtrateth; *They went into the holy citie, and appeared unto many.* Certainly, if they had gone into heaven, they muſt have appeared unto *all* there: for as [d] *No corner of heaven is hid from any*; ſo there all things preſent are ſeen face to face; their matutine knowledge infinitely ſurpaſſeth our veſpertine; all and every one ſee all and every one preſent.

[d] *Cælum eſt ſingulis totum, omnibus unum.*

3. Yet even from theſe very words, *They appeared unto many*, Maldonat gathereth, that they did not appeare commonly, or indifferently, or generally to all: from whence he inferreth, *If they aroſe to die again, they would have appeared not to many, as the Evangeliſt ſaid they did; but vulgò omnibus, promiſcuouſly to all.* I anſwer; They appeared to all; *viz.* All that met them, ſaw them, and ſaw them as *men*, and as *other men*; but not as *newly raiſed men*; for ſo onely they appeared to *Many*; as Chriſt himſelf did appeare *Teſtibus præordinatis à Deo*

Deo, Unto witneſſes choſen before of God, Act. 10. 41. ſo did they, to ſuch onely as God had appointed.

To evince this diſtinction, let it be conſidered, whether every one who ſaw Lazarus after his reſurrection, ſaw him as a raiſed man, or as an ordinary man. But if Lazarus might appeare commonly to all men, and yet appeare unto *Many* onely, as a man raiſed lately from the dead; theſe Saints alſo might be ſeen, and were ſeen of all that paſſed by and looked on them (*apparuerunt vulgò omnibus, they appeared ordinarily to all*;) and yet they might be ſeen not by all, but onely appeare to *Many*, as perſons raiſed of purpoſe for holy ends. And this opinion I hold to be more probable then that of Franciſcus Lucas Brugenſis on the place, That onely unto ſome the raiſed did *aliquando apparere, aliquando diſparere, ſicut Jeſus, Sometime appeare to ſome, and ſometimes vaniſh, as our Saviour did.* I anſwer, he had ſaid ſomewhat, if the reſurrection had been of the ſame nature with Jeſus his reſurrection. And as I diſlike him not, if by *diſparere* he meaneth that they did not alwayes converſe with the ſame men, but changed company: ſo if by it he underſtandeth a ſudden vaniſhing from the ſight of men, and implyeth that the *Many* raiſed had a power to be viſible and inviſible at their pleaſure; till he bring proof to evince it, he ſhall give me leave to parallell it to the fiction of Gyges and his ring: whoſe broad beazil, or inſealing part, if he turned to the palm of his hand, he was forthwith inviſible, yet himſelf ſaw all things; but if he turned it to the back ſide of his hand, he was as conſpicuous as an other man. So Cicero in the third book of his offices, out of Plato.

4. The ſame Maldonat preſſeth us ſore with an other argument: *What ſhould they do here, living again in mortall bodies, who had a taſte of Gods glory? ſurely they had been in worſe condition, then if they never had been raiſed out of the boſome of Abraham, where they were quiet, to come to a turbulent life again.* Becauſe this Maldonat is an importunate ſnarler at our religion, I give him this bone to gnaw upon: and for my firſt anſwer, I will call to minde the prodigious Legend, which divers eminent men of their own ſide have recorded of one Chriſtina, called by them, by way of eminency, [e]*Wonderfull.* To omit what Surius and others relate, I will ſpeak in the words of Dionyſius the Carthuſian: [f]*Chriſtina died young, —and was carried into paradiſe to the throne of the Divine majeſty:— and ſhe was ineffably glad, God congratulating with her. And the Lord ſaid, Truly this is my deereſt daughter.* And then he telleth, That God gave her choice, either to ſtay with him, or to return unto her bodie, and by penitentiall works to ſatisfie for all the ſouls in purgatorie, and to edi-

[e] *Mirabilis.*

[f] *Cùm defuncta eſſet in pueritiâ, — ducta erat in paradiſum, ad Thronum Majeſtatis Divinæ: — Domino congratulante, ineffabiliter gaviſa eſt: Dixitque Dominus, Revera; hæc chariſſima filia eſt.*

[b] *Cum meritorum augmentis.*

ſie thoſe who lived, and to return to God, [b] *with increaſe of her merits.* She anſwered the Lord preſently, that for that cauſe ſhe would return to her bodie: And ſo ſhe did: and becauſe ſinnefull men by their ſtench did too much afflict her, (O tender-noſed virgin!) ſhe did flie, (or the Papiſts did lie) and ſit on the top-boughes of trees, pinacles, or turrets; (ſince noiſome ſmells aſcend, it had been her farre better courſe, to have crept into ſome dennes, and caverns of the earth, or vaults and tombes, as he ſaith ſhe did ſometimes) and when her neighbours, or kindred thought her mad, and kept her from meat, ſhe prayed once to God, and milk came out of her breaſts, (was not ſhe an intemerate rare virgin!) and ſo ſhe refreſhed herſelf. This, and a great deal more hath that Carthuſian, (holy and learned above many of their ſide) *de quatuor noviſſimis part. 3. Artic. 16.*

Let cenſorious and maledicent Maldonat ponder theſe things well; and it will ſtop his mouth for ever from barking at the belief of us, whom they ſtyle Hugonets, Calviniſts, Hereticks; though none of us think, or ſay otherwiſe, then the good Pacianus did of old, in his firſt epiſtle to Sempronius, CHRISTIAN *is my name, and* CATHOLICK *is my ſurname.* The Turks indeed have ſome ſtrange figments of this nature: but though the Mahumetan prieſts have deviſed and feigned many ſuperſtitious miracles concerning their great Sainteſſe Nafiſſa, as is confeſſed by Joannes Leo in his African hiſtorie, *lib.* 8. yet the Papiſts have ſurmounted both this and other their impoſtures, with this their mirabilarie Chriſtina.

Secondly, concerning theſe *Many* raiſed, I anſwer unto Maldonat, They continued not long in this life, but (as I gueſſe) ſhortly after Chriſts aſcenſion, laid their bodies down to ſleep again in the earth. Thirdly, what thinks Maldonat of Lazarus? Was not his ſoul in Abrahams boſome (as well as the other poore Lazarus his ſoul) who was ſo tenderly beloved of Chriſt, and his Apoſtles? and yet he lived long after: and whatſoever can be objected againſt theſe Saints, holds ſtronger againſt Lazarus. Fourthly, I denie that they by their return into the fleſh, were in worſe condition. Lorinus on Acts 9. 41. ſaith, [c] *It is no trouble to a man, if being dead he obey Gods call, and live again.* And Salmeron ſaith, No reaſon, but holy men at Gods command may put on and put off their own bodies as well, and as contentedly, as the Angels do their aſſumed bodies: which I do the rather beleeve, becauſe I do ſay with Toſtatus, on the 2. King. 4. Quæſt. 56, *Though it cannot be certainly proved, yet it is probable, That none of thoſe that ever were raiſed, did periſh everlaſtingly, nor that any reprobate had the favour of an extraordinary reſurrection: for a ſeparated ſoul that hath been*

[c] *Non affert moleſtiam, ut Deo vocanti mortuus obtemperet reviviſcendo.*

been partaker of these unspeakable joyes, will esteem worse then dung, or salt that hath lost its savour, all the pleasures and profits of this life; though their severall excellencies were distilled into one quintessence of perfection. So that, as Lorinus saith well in the place above cited, *Whosoever hath once escaped the perill of damnation, he shall not come into the same danger again.*

5. The last objection that I have met withall is this, That to die the second time is no favour, but a punishment; and a punishment iterated. I answer, If a righteous man should die thrice, or oftner; death is no punishment unto him; yea to passe seven times through hell, to come once and everlastingly to heaven, a despairing soul would hold to be a cheap blessednesse. Secondly, Suarez himself saith, *It is no punishment to die the second time, no more then it was to Moses, to die twice; as saith Augustine, de Mirabilib. Scripturæ* 3. 10. *though others dissent from Augustine.* Nay (saith Suarez) *To lay down their bodies the second time, is more acceptable and pleasing to God.* To this doth Peter Martyr agree in 1.King. 4. 22. *If by mans hurt, or losse, God be glorified; it is no injurie to man.* But in truth it is no hurt, or losse to man: for, saith Barradius, *Perchance, without any pains they might redeliver their carcases to the earth:* And if the pains be any; *the pains both of the latter and former death, may be so tempered and diminished, that they both shall not exceed the pains of one death*, saith Peter Martyr, *ibid.* Which learned Peter Martyr out of S. Augustine *de Mirabilib. Scripturæ* 3. *ult.* hath an excellent observation or two. First, That to every man is setled and appointed a prefixed time of death. Secondly, That before the last prefixed time some do die, that they that raise them up to life may be more famous, and God more glorified. And this is proved by the very phrase which Christ used concerning Lazarus, John 11. 4. *This sickneſſe is not unto death:* Yet did he die; and besides the time intercedent between his death and his buriall, he was foure dayes buried. But his sickneſſe was not [d] *to an intire death, in which estate he should remain.* Neither is that so properly called death, [e] *when it is abortive, and cometh before its time.* So, Luke 8. 52. *She is not dead, but sleepeth;* and yet verse 55. *her spirit came again:* Therefore it was gone, and she was dead. So that we may shut up this point with this percloſe, and with a distinction out of Peter Martyr, from S. Augustine; Death is so termed, either *properly*, or *improperly*; *compleatly*, or *incompleatly*. If you take death *properly*, and *compleatly*, for that separation of the soul, which cannot admit an other conjunction or union with the bodie till the generall resurrection: then no man ever died but once, or

[d] *Ad mortem plenam, in qua Lazarus maneret.*
[e] *Quando præoccupat ultimum terminum.*

was come *ad plenam mortem*, to that prefixed period and laſt houre of life; but their former death was onely *improper*, *preparatorie*, and *abortive*. Now if you take death *improperly* and *incompleatly*, for any manner of true ſeparation, which indeed is the commoneſt acception; a man may die twice, and divers have died twice; yea, all they that ever were raiſed in the Old and New Teſtament (except our Saviour onely, who cooperated to his own reſurrection) all they, and every of them, died the ſecond time.

6. [f] *The priviledge of a few checketh not, offendeth not the law of nature, as Origen obſerveth more then once*, ſaith Eraſmus on the 1. Theſſal. 4. or in Hieroms phraſe, [g] *The prerogatives of ſingular men eſtabliſh not a law:* or, in the way of Auguſtine, [h] *The priviledge of a few doth not derogate from the generall law.* Though it be *ordinarily* appointed for all men once to die, yet *extraordinarily*, ſome may not die at all, and ſome muſt die twice. For, [i] *God may and can diſpenſe with a common ſtatute of his own*, ſaith Holcot, on Wiſdome the 2. His hands are free, who hath manicled the whole world by his laws: he is not tied by Stoicall fatall neceſſitie, *who is Agens liberrimum, a moſt voluntarie free agent.*

[f] *Paucorum prærogativa non officit legi Naturæ, ut aliquoties monet Origines.*
[g] *Singulorum privilegia legem efficere non poſſunt.*
[h] *Privilegium paucorum univerſali legi non derogat.*
[i] *Potens eſt Deus cum ſtatuto communi diſpenſare.*

Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Hoſts, I humbly implore thy favourable protection: ſtrengthen me, O gracious God, againſt all mine enemies, bodily and ghoſtly; and when I have by thy power fought a good fight, when I have finiſhed my courſe, take me, I beſeech thee, from being a member of thy Church militant, *in this* Jeruſalem below, *to be partaker of bleſſednesſe with thy Church* triumphant, *in* Jeruſalem above, *the Mother of us all: which petition I earneſtly preſent unto thy Sacred Majeſtie, in the name and mediation of my onely Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt. Amen.*

CHAP.

CHAP. XIX.

1. Strange conceits concerning Nero, from Suetonius, Tacitus, Hierom, Auguſtine. Nero ſuppoſed to be Antichriſt.

2. An other incredible relation of the Armenian, who is ſaid to have lived at Chriſts paſsion. The Armenians have their holy frauds.

AS I began with two or three ſtrange hiſtories, having ſome relation to the propounded queſtion: ſo I hold it not amiſſe, to end with two or three, which ſhall give ſome light to ſome other parts of this queſtion, or at leaſt by their ſtrangeneſſe ſhall afford delight; though I end in a fable.

Suetonius, *in Nerone cap.* 27. toward the end, thus hiſtorifieth; [a] *There were ſome who for a long time did deck the tombe of Nero with flowers, both of the ſpring and ſummer: and ſometimes did bring his ſtatues and reſemblances adorned with long purple imbroydered robes, into the pleading places; now and then they would proclaim his Edicts, as if he had been alive, and would ſhortly return to the damage of his enemies. To conclude, After twentie yeares when I was but a youth, when there appeared on the ſtage an odde fellow, who bragged that he was Nero; ſo great reſpect was ſhewed to his name and credit, that he had great helps and aids, and with much ado was delivered up.* So farre Suetonius. Tacitus alſo, *Hiſtor.* 2. reports, that many did beleeve Nero did live long after he was dead. S. Hierom to Algaſia, *de undecim quæſt. quæſt. ultimâ*, makes Nero a fore-runner of Antichriſt, and he gives this ſenſe to theſe words, 2. Theſſ. 2. 7. [b] NOW THE MYSTERIE OF INIQUITIE WORKETH: *By thoſe many harms and ſinnes,* (ſaith he) *by which Nero, the worſt of all the Ceſars, oppreſſeth the world, Antichriſts coming is breeding and readie to come to light: and what Antichriſt ſhall do hereafter, Nero now in part accompliſheth.* S. Auguſtine his relation goeth one ſtep further, [c] *Some do ſuſpect and imagine* (ſaith he) *that Nero ſhall riſe again and be Antichriſt: Others think that Nero was not ſlain, but was withdrawn, when they thought he was murdered; and that he lieth hid, living in the vigour of that age, wherein he was when they thought he was ſlain.* Which ſtorie when I read, it recalled to my minde a more uncouth relation of an other dive-dopper. And this it is:

2. In Matthew Paris, on the eleventh yeare of Henry the third, *anno Chriſti* 1228. in his greater hiſtorie printed at

[a] *Non defuerunt qui per longum tempus vernis æſtiviſque floribus tumulum Neronis ornarent; ac modò imagines prætextatas in roſtris proferrent, modò edicta, quaſi viventis, & magno inimicorum malo reverſuri.—Denique, cùm poſt viginti annos, adoleſcente me, extitiſſet conditionis incertæ, qui ſe Neronem eſſe jactaret; tam favorabile nomen ejus apud Parthos fuit, ut vehementer adjutus, & vix redditus ſit.*

[b] Jam myſterium operatur iniquitatis: *Multis malis & peccatis, quibus Nero impuriſſimus Cæſarum mundum premit, Antichriſti parturitur adventus. &c.*

[c] *Nonnulli illum reſurrecturum, & futurum Antichriſtum ſuſpicantur. &c.* de Civit. 20. 19

London, pag. 470. it is ſaid, That an Arch-biſhop of Armenia came into England in pilgrimage; was entertained at S. Albans Abby: Being there asked touching that Joſeph, of whom there was a common ſpeech, that he was preſent when Chriſt ſuffered, and ſpake with him, and that he yet liveth as a firm proof of the Chriſtian faith, the Arch-biſhop anſwered, That he knew Joſeph well; and the Antiochian (who was the interpreter to the Arch-biſhop) told the whole ſtorie thus to Henry Spigurnel his acquaintance, and the Abbots ſervant, That before the Arch-biſhop came out of Armenia, Joſeph uſed to be at his table; that at the Paſsion when Chriſt was haled from before Pilate to the croſſe, the ſaid Joſeph (then called *Cartaphilus*) being uſher of the Court, did moſt ſcornfully punch Chriſt on the back, as he went out of the doore; and mocking ſaid, *Go faſter Jeſus: Go, Why ſtayeſt thou?* But Chriſt looking back with a ſtern eye and countenance on him, ſaid, *I go indeed, but thou ſhalt expect*, or *ſtay till I come:* As if he had ſaid, The Sonne of Man goeth indeed, as it is written of him; and muſt be crucified, and die, and ſhall live again: but thou ſhalt abide, and not die, till my ſecond coming.

It is further added, that this Cartaphilus was, at the time of Chriſts death, about thirty yeares old; and ſo often as he cometh to one hundred yeares, he is taken with a ſeeming incurable diſeaſe, and is as it were in an ecſtaſie: then growing better, *redit redivivus, returneth young, lively, and luſty*, to the ſtate of thirty yeares. After Chriſts death he was baptized by Ananias (who baptized S. Paul) and was called *Joſeph:* he is reputed to be a man of a moſt auſtere and continent life, humble, and patient; and liveth in both the Armeniaes, among Clergy men. Thus farre Matthew Paris; who was a Monk of Saint Albans, at that time. And in the like words the ſtorie is reported by Thomas of Rudbourn, a Monk of Wincheſter, in his Chronicle, which is a manuſcript; as the great ſearcher of antiquities Mr Selden, my very worthy friend, aſſured me.

If this Joſeph *redit redivivus*, he hath not died twice onely, but very often.

I have recounted theſe narrations for their pleaſant varieties; perhaps (I may ſay) rarities: But as S. Auguſtine branded the former ſtorie, and the beleevers of it, ſaying, [e] *The great preſumption of theſe opinioniſts makes me much marvell:* So I will not be afraid to tax the latter of impoſture: both becauſe of the varietie of Names, by which he is called, as you may finde in the learned Mr Seldens illuſtrations on Polyolbion, pag. 15. where he alſo citeth the incredible fable of Ruan, which is couſin-german to the relation of the Eaſtern

[e] *Multùm mihi mira eſt hæc opinantium tanta præſumptio.*

ſtern Cartaphilus; and becauſe the Armenians, as well as the Romans, have their holy frauds: as was ſeen by our men, laught at by the Turks, and beleeved by the ſilly Laicks of Armenia, whileſt their Prieſts would ſtrive to fetch falſe fire from Chriſts ſepulchre on Eaſter even. See Mr Sands in his third book, pag. 173.

Laſtly, if this ſtorie of the Armenian could be an undoubted truth; the Greek Church would ere this have produced him, to juſtifie the practiſe and opinions of the Eaſtern Church againſt the Weſtern, wherein they diſſented: But no ſuch thing was ever attempted: And therefore let this be caſt into the number of fables.

Soli DEO gloria.

FINIS.

MISCELLANIES OF DIVINITIE.

THE THIRD BOOK.

CHAP. I.

1. *Many Papists are very peremptorie, that all and every one must die. Melchior Canus is more moderate. The words are onely indefinite, not universall.*

2. *Objections brought to prove, that universally all shall die. Their answers. Generall rules have exception. Even many learned Papists have acknowledged so much. The point handled, especially against Bellarmine.*

3. *Indefinites have not the force of universals. Even universals are restrained.*

4. *Salmeron bringeth many objections to prove an absolute necessitie that every one shall die. All his objections answered. Mans living in miserie is a kinde of death.*

THe third question is, Whether Adam and his children, all and every one of them, without priviledge or exception, must and shall die? It ariseth also from the same fountain from which the two former questions did proceed: *It is appointed unto men to die.*

The answer consisteth of three parts: That there may be an exception of some; That some have been excepted; That others shall be excepted. And so the answer is returned with the negative, thus, *All and every one shall not die:* For though it be appointed for men to die; yet the appointment may be, hath been, and shall be reversed.

Neither fear I the saying of Aquinas, *part. 3. quæst. 78. artic. 1.* [a] *It is the more common and more safe opinion of the Divines, That every one must die.* And this opinion is maintained with stiffe and peremptory obstinacie, by our adversa-

[a] *Est communior & securior sententia Theologorum, Unumquemque morituum.*

ries the Papiſts. Boſquier in his *Terror orbis*, Salmeron upon the 1. Theſſal. 4. Gregory de Valent. with others are reſolute, That none can be diſpenſed withall, but all mankinde, and every childe of Adam muſt die. But Melchior Canus is more moderate; [b] *Though it be appointed for all men to die*, (ſaith he) *yet that one or two out of that generall law by priviledge be exempted, is not ſo againſt Scriptures, that it may not be queſtioned.* And, *Locor. Theol.* 7. 3. *Numer.* 9. he proveth that it is no way againſt Scripture, *That the thrice-bleſſed mother of our Lord, may by ſingular priviledge be exempted*, (he had erred if he had ſaid, *Is priviledged*) *from the univerſall law of all being born in ſinne*; and further confirmeth it by this inſtance, *Becauſe the Scriptures ſay in generall, Exod.*33.20. NO MAN SHALL SEE ME AND LIVE; *and John* 1.18. NO MAN HATH SEEN GOD AT ANY TIME: *yet Moſes and Paul ſaw God.* And though ordinarily there is no return from death to life, and the Saints come not back again from heaven to dwell on earth; yet Auguſtine ſaith, *in lib. de Cura pro mortuis, Cap.* 15. [c] *The Scripture witneſſeth that ſome from the dead have been ſent to the living, as Moſes to Chriſt: and on the other ſide, Paul being living was carried into Paradiſe.*

[b] *Locorum Theologic. l.* 2. *Num.*3.

[c] *Mitti quoque ad vivos, aliquos ex mortuis, ut Moſem ad Chriſtum: ſicut è contrario, Paulus ex vivis in Paradiſum raptus eſt, Divina Scriptura teſtatur.*

Again, I ſay the words of the Apoſtle are onely *indefinite*, not *generall:* it is not ſaid, Ἀπόκειται πᾶσι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, *It is appointed to all men:* but, *It is appointed unto men:* whether all, or onely ſome, is not here determined.

Now becauſe this place wants its ſtrength and nerves, to prove that point; and neither in the Greek, nor Vulgat, nor Syriack, is the univerſall expreſſed; the Jeſuits have amaſſed up together many places of Scripture to confirm their opinion.

2. *What man is he that liveth, and ſhall not ſee death?* Pſal. 89.48. *In Adam all die*, 1. Corinth. 15. 22. *Death is the houſe appointed for all living*, Job 30. 23. *Death paſſed upon all men*, Rom. 5. 12. *He ſhall be brought to the grave, and remain in the tombe: The clods of the valley ſhall be ſweet unto him, and every man ſhall draw after him, as there are innumerable before him*, Job 21.32. MORTE MORIERIS, *Thou ſhalt die the death* (Gen.2.17.) was threatned to Adam, and all his: and therefore God, who cannot lie, will ſee it accompliſhed.

To the laſt place I anſwer firſt: It is well rendred and expounded, *Mortalis eris, Obnoxius eris morti; Thou ſhalt be mortall, and ſubject to death*, as Lyra and Vatablus have it. Beda on Geneſ.2. *Morti deputatus eris, Thou ſhalt be condemned to death.* Chryſoſtom, on John, Homil. 27. [d] *Adam died by guilt and judgement, though execution was ſuſpended.* And to ſay truth, In the midſt of *life* we are in *death:* Man is dying, till he be dead. Infirmities and ſickneſſe *purſue men till they periſh*, Deuteronomie 28. 22. *The wicked ſhall finde no eaſe*

[d] *Adam mortuus eſt, ſi non Re, tamen Sententiâ.*

nor

nor reſt, but ſhall have trembling hearts, fayling of eyes, and ſorrow of minde, verſe 65. *Thy life ſhall hang in doubt before thee, and thou ſhalt fear day and night, and ſhalt have no aſſurance of thy life*, verſ. 66.

To all the other alledged places of Scripture, one anſwer fitly ſerveth: *viz.* That the holy Writ ſpeaketh of the ordinary courſe of Nature, and hath no intent to limit Gods power, or to binde the Lawmaker; but he may exempt from death whomſoever he pleaſeth. For generall rules are not without exceptions. It is moſt true, what Ariſtotle, *de Hiſtor. Animal.* 7. 10. generally avoucheth, [d] *No childe crieth in the mothers wombe:* and yet extraordinarily it may be true, what Libavius *in lib. de vagitu uterino*, and Albertus Magnus *lib.* 10. *de Animalibus*, and Solinus in his third chapter, report; to wit, *Quoſdam embriones plorâſſe in utero, That ſome Embrioes have wept and cried out in their mothers wombe*: As on the contrary, what Livie *lib.* 24. recordeth; namely, *Infantem in utero matris* IO TRIUMPHALE *clamâſſe, That an infant in the mothers wombe ſang the Outcrie uſed in triumphs*: And what Appian of Alexandr. *de bellis civilibus Roman. lib.* 4. almoſt in the beginning relateth, *That a childe ſpake ſo ſoon as it was born: which was a prognoſtick of ſorrow, againſt the erection of the* TRIUMVIRI. Petrus Pomponatius, *in lib. de incantationibus, cap.* 10. goeth one ſtep further: and though it be a little out of my way, yet ſuffer me to follow him: [e] *Haly Aben-Ragel* (ſaith he) *by Aſtrologie knew and foretold that a new born childe ſhould preſently propheſie; as Conciliator relateth.* So the univerſall law of all mens dying, may ſtand in full force and vertue, and yet be abridged by ſome extraordinary exceptions, through the unlimited command of the moſt free Lawmaker. My proofs that univerſall propoſitions do not alwaies exclude ſome particular contraries, ſhall be of ſuch generall rules as are limited by the Papiſts themſelves: becauſe the controverſie now in agitation, is onely againſt them.

The great maſter of Controverſies, Bellarmine himſelf, *de Purgatorio* 1. 12. ſpeaking of the taking up of the good thief into Paradiſe, ſaith, [f] *A few mens priviledges eſtabliſh not a law.*

Gerſon, that learned Chancellour of Paris, in his Sermon on the birth of the thrice bleſſed Virgin, the third part, thus ſettleth; [g] *It is apparent, that God hath not tied his mercifull ſalvation to the common laws of Chriſtian veritie: no not ſo to the Sacraments themſelves, but, without prejudice of that law, he may ſanctifie children in the wombe, with the baptiſme of his grace, or power of the holy Spirit.*

Matthias Felizius, pag. 184. acknowledgeth, that extraordinarily the ſouls of good and bad men do ſometimes come out of heaven and hell: yet are there generall ſtatutes and the ordinary courſe oppoſite and contrarie.

[d] Πεὶν ἐξελθεῖν, ἐ φθέγγεσθαι τὸ παιδίον.

[e] *Haly Aben-Ragel ſcientiâ ſyderum ſcivit prædicere, puerum natum ſtatim prophetaturum, ſicut refert Conciliator.*

[f] *Privilegia paucorum legem non faciunt.*

[g] *Conſtat, Deum miſericordiam ſalvationis ſuæ non ità legibus communibus traditionis Chriſtianæ, non ità Sacramentis ipſis alligâſſe, quin, abſque præjudicio legis ejuſdem, poſſit pueros nondum natos intus ſanctificare, Gratiæ ſuæ baptiſmo, vel virtute Spiritus ſancti.*

By an argument drawn from ſpeciall priviledge, *Petrus Thyræus, de locis infeſtis, part. 1. cap. 9.* maintaineth, That humane ſouls may return out of Purgatorie; yea, out of Hell. [h] *The Law-maker (* ſaith he*) hath an eye ſtill aiming at a generall good: which generall good, if it take place and ſucceed without the law, it is no great detriment or wrong to the law.*

Cardinal Tolet, on John 1.3. [i] *Sometimes we ſpeak generally, to ſignifie a numerous multitude: though we do not mean to compriſe all and every parcell of that multitude.* 1. Cor. 9.25. *Every man that ſtriveth for the maſterie, is temperate in all things:* But neither do all abſtain, nor do they, who abſtain, abſtain from all things. Which truth in the mouth of Tolet, might be confirmed at large by the Fathers. Let S. Hierom onely give in his verdict; Hierom, *Tom. 3. Epiſt. ad Damaſum, de Prodigo,* thus, [k] *It is even a rule in Scripture, that the word ALL hath not reference to the whole* (comprehending every ſingular particular) *but to the greateſt part.* And as *OMNIS, All,* ſo likewiſe *NULLUS, None,* is reſtrained, 1. Kings 18.10. where the words *No nation or kingdome,* extend not through the whole world; but are to be reduced and confined to thoſe Nations or Kingdomes which were Achabs ſubjects or tributaries, to whom he might and could adminiſter an oath: which he did not, could not do in the dominions of other abſolute free Princes.

I muſt yet come up cloſer to Bellarmine. Gen. 7.18. *Repleverunt aquæ Omnia in ſuperficie terræ,* as it is in their Vulgat: though it be not ſo, either in the Hebrew, or Greek. And, *All the high hills that were under the whole heaven were covered,* verſ. 19. Yet Bellarmine, *in lib. de Gratia primi hominis, cap.* 4. excepteth Paradiſe, which, being on earth, was not overflown.

Geneſ. 7.21. *All fleſh died, — and every man:* and verſ. 22. *All in whoſe noſtrills was the breath of life — died:* and verſ. 23. *Every living ſubſtance — both man and cattell, &c.* Yet for all theſe generalities, Bellarmine, in the place cited, excepteth Enoch, who then lived upon earth, in Paradiſe, as he imagined.

Rom. 5.12. *Death paſſed upon all, for that all have ſinned.* But, [l] *The Virgin Mary was prevented by Gods ſpeciall grace, ſo that ſhe was free from ſinne ſo ſoon as ſhe had any being,* ſaith Bellarmine, *Tom. 3. de amiſſione grat. & ſtatu peccat. 4. 16.* He exempteth her by ſpeciall priviledge from ſinne. Why may not we, by the force of his reaſon, exempt an other from death? Moreover, Enoch and Elias, at what time S. Paul wrote theſe words, were not dead; though the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of things paſt: nor are dead yet, as the Papiſts hold. Gorran on the place anſwereth appoſitely, *Death went over all, REATU, non ACTU; by way of guiltineſſe,* not *actually.* 1. Cor.

h *Bonum publicum Legiſlatori ſemper propoſitum eſt: hoc ſi, lege præteritâ, obtineri poteſt, legis ratio magna non habetur.*

i *Aliquando ſolemus generatim loqui; ad multitudinem ſignificandam; quamvis non omnes partes multitudinis comprehendantur.*

k *Canon Scripturarum eſt,* Omnia *non ad totum referenda, ſed ad maximam partem.*

l *Præventa fuit Maria ſingulari gratiâ & privilegio Dei, ut ſimul & eſſe & juſta eſſe inciperet.*

1. Corinth. 15. 51, &c. *We ſhall all be changed at the laſt trump:* Yet Bellarmine, *de Romano Pontifice*, 3. 6. ſaith that Enoch and Elias ſhall die and riſe again before the generall reſurrection: till which time the laſt trump bloweth not: And Chriſt was riſen before; though the words be large: and not Chriſt alone; but (if Holcot be not deceived, on Wiſd. 2. 5.) [m] *It is an holy belief of the Church, that the bleſſed mother of Chriſt hath obtained a full and perfect reſurrection.* Which words ſuffice to croſſe other Papiſts, who denie that any exception is to be made to the generall axioms; though by us they are held as fables.

[m] *De Matre Chriſti benedicta, piè credit Eccleſia, quòd ſit in ea reſurrectio completa.*

3. Let us take a view of ſome indefinites, and we ſhall not finde them to be univerſally applied.

The Prophets are dead, John 8.53. yet *Enoch was a Prophet,* Jude verſ. 14. and Elijah was chief among Prophets: Notwithſtanding, theſe were not dead. Revel. 14. 13. *The dead reſt from their labours*; yet divers have been raiſed from a true death, and have returned again into this world of labour. My very Text is fertile of more particulars to this purpoſe, *It is appointed unto men to die* ἅπαξ, SEMEL; UNO TEMPORE, as it is in the Syriack, word for word: yet ſome have died twice. *It is appointed unto men once to die, and after that cometh* JUDGEMENT: but Chriſt was not judged after he died. That he was judged in the particular judgement of ſouls, cannot be; ſince himſelf is there the Judge. So ſhall he alſo be judge in the generall judgement.

But let us return to the univerſalls. Matth. 26. 33. *Though all men ſhall be offended becauſe of thee, yet will I never be offended:* yet was he a man: and if the words there be reſtrained to all Chriſts Diſciples or Apoſtles; yet Peter accounts himſelf none of that all; and exempts himſelf from the number of them that would be ſcandalized. 1. Corinth. 15. 27. *He hath put all things under his feet: But when he ſaith all things are put under him, it is manifeſt that he is excepted which did put all things under him.* Heb. 11. 13. *Theſe All died in faith:* Yet Aquinas truely there excepteth Enoch.

Aquinas, *in* 4. *lib. Sentent. diſt.* 43. *artic.* 4. thus, *By the ſame reaſons by which we ſhewed that all ſhould ariſe from the dead, may we ſhew alſo, that all ſhall ariſe A CINERIBUS, in the generall reſurrection: unleſſe by eſpeciall grace the contrarie be granted to ſome; as the haſtening of the reſurrection is granted to ſome.* Where Aquinas confeſſeth that ſome are diſpenſed withall, both for incineration, that their bodies ſhould not be turned into duſt; and ſome alſo ſhall have a ſpeedier reſurrection by an eſpeciall grace. Why then, by the eſpeciall grace of the ſame God, may not ſome be freed from the ſtroke of death?

4. Salmeron tuggeth it out hard by the teeth, to uphold

that none ſhall be acquitted from death; but, without exception, all muſt die. Hearken to his reaſons.

n *If death ſpared not Chriſt and his Mother, whom will death ſpare?* I anſwer, Death ſpareth none; ſo that no one can ſay, I will not die. Death ſpareth none: but he that hath the power of death, may ſpare whom he pleaſeth. Fire and water have no mercie: yet the three children were preſerved in the fire, and S. Peter walked upon the ſea. The rivers have divided themſelves; yea, the Red ſea gathered it ſelf together, and was as a wall on the right hand and on the left, in the paſſage of the children of Iſrael toward Canaan. God, above the pitch of humane reaſon, may free whom he will from death; and ſhut up the mouth of the grave, that it ſhall not ſwallow ſome, as he did the mouthes of the lions, when he ſaved Daniel.

Again ſaith Salmeron, o *Who die not with Chriſt*, or *as well as Chriſt, ſhall not ariſe, nor be members of his bodie.* All the Jeſuits in the earth cannot demonſtrate that propoſition. If they uſe S. Auguſtines reaſon, p *Onely the dead ſhall ariſe: But all ſhall ariſe: Therefore all ſhall die:* I anſwer with S. Auguſtine, and many more (what is handled at large in the third part) q *Change ſhall be a kinde of reſurrection:* and in the propoſition, *The dead* are not taken ſtrictly; but largely, for any ſuch as have changed their firſt life. But take we *the dead* properly and natively, for ſuch onely as indeed have died; the propoſition is falſe, and muſt be denied; ſince we ſhall not all die, but ſome ſhall be changed; and yet both the one and the other ſort ſhall be raiſed.

Salmeron again, on 1. Cor. 15. thus objecteth; r *While the bridegroom tarried, they all ſlumbred and ſlept,* Matth. 25. 5. Did not Salmeron ſleep, ſlumber, and dream, when he produceth theſe words to prove that all ſhall die? when the words have apparent reference to the ſupine ſecuritie of their mindes; and perhaps, if you will, to their bodily ſluggiſhneſſe, drowſineſſe, and ſleep, if there were any realitie in the parable. Death was never meant in theſe words: for Chriſt doth not *there*, that is, *at the reſurrection*, tarrie; but *he that ſhall come will come, and will not tarrie*, Heb. 10. 37. He continueth objecting thus; s THOU FOOL, THAT WHICH THOU SOWEST IS NOT QUICKENED EXCEPT IT DIE, 1. Cor. 15. 36. *Therefore All ſhall die, becauſe All ſhall be quickened.* I anſwer, The Apoſtles drift in that place is, not to ſhew whether any ſhall remain alive, or all die: but he onely proveth by naturall reaſon, that reſurrection may grow out of putrefaction. Secondly, even they themſelves who ſay *All muſt die*, cannot take the words exactly as they ſound. For then as the ſeed hath time to rot, and rotteth ere it quicken: ſo the bodies of men ſhould ſuffer

n *Si Chriſto & matri Chriſti mors non pepercit, cui parcet?*

o *Qui cum Chriſto mortui non ſunt, non reſurgent, nec erunt membra ejus.*

p *Reſurrectio eſt ſolummodo mortuorum: At omnes reſurgent: Ergò omnes morientur.*

q *Immutatio erit vice reſurrectionis.*

r *Tardante Sponſo, dormitaverunt omnes, & dormierunt.*

s Stulte, quod ſeminas non vivificatur niſi mortuum fuerit: *Ergò Omnes morientur, quia Omnes vivificabuntur.*

fer corruption and putrifaction, as the ſeeds do; which they dare not ſay. Laſtly, ſeeds do not die *properly*; there is no ſeparation of a ſoul from a bodie: they die *analogally* and *improperly*: and ſo do even thoſe who ſhall not *die*, but ſhall be *changed*.

An other objection is, Geneſ. 3. 19. *Duſt thou art, and unto duſt ſhalt thou return.* Peter Martyr anſwereth, [t] *That is, whileſt this world laſteth, and till the day of judgement break off the courſe of nature.* But I ſay, that even ſuch as maintain that every one muſt die, will not ſay they ſhall *reverti in terram, Be incinerated and turned into duſt and earth:* for they allow a very ſhort time, till the bodies reunion.

If any will ſtill urge the generality, and preſſe the extent of the words, and force of the decree, *It is appointed unto men to die:* I anſwer with Bellarmine himſelf, [u] *The decree is performed, if all the poſterity of Adam be obnoxious to death:* Or as S. Auguſtine anſwered the Pelagians, concerning thoſe which ſhall be alive at Chriſts coming; [x] *It ſufficeth that they were appointed to die: and die they ſhould if the world had endured. By caſualty they are freed from death, nor doth the diſpenſation with ſome particular ones infringe the univerſall cauſe,* as I vouched in the ſecond book. And (as S. Auguſtine goeth on) *when they have lived a life full of miſerie, and calamitie; who can ſay, they have not taſted death? eſpecially, ſince thirſt, hunger, cold, heat, infirmities, croſſes, ſickneſſes, are nothing elſe but a daily dying.* In which regard the wiſe woman of Tekoa, in her ſubtile oration ſaith not, *We ſhall all, and every one die;* but 2. Sam. 14. 14. *We die* (MORIENDO MORIMUR; ſo runneth the Hebrew) *and are as water ſpilt on the ground*; when immediately, both before and after, ſhe had ſpoken of outward croſſes. [y] *Even whileſt we are growing, our life decreaſeth*, ſaith Seneca: Which S. Auguſtine, *in libro Soliloq. cap.* 2. thus enlargeth, [z] *My life in going forward, groweth backward: and by how much it advanceth forward, by ſo much it maketh a nearer approach to death.* As the fire it ſelf conſumes its fuell, and is nouriſhed by the conſumption of it: ſo mans age is fed and nouriſhed by the conſumption of his life, and of the age he liveth in. Man at the ſame time begins to *live*, and *die:* for LIFE is but the way tending to DEATH: [a] *In our birth we die; yea long before it.* From the inſtant of the ſouls infuſion, we begin to die. Laſtly, I ſay, in that Chriſt died for all, Although ſome be extraordinarily diſpenſed withall, every one may be ſaid to die; *Chriſt by the grace of God taſted death for every man.* Hebr. 2. 9. Thus much ſhall ſerve for the firſt part of the anſwer.

t *Id eſt, Quamdiu orbis durare pergat, & niſi dies judicii curſum naturæ intercipiat.*

u *Decreto ſatisfieri videtur, ſi omnes Adæ poſteri, morti obnoxii ſunt.* Tom. 3. de amiſſione grat. & ſtat. pec. 4. 15.

x *Satis eſt, illos fuiſſe morti deſtinatos; quæ ſubſecuta eſſet, ſi ſeculum proceſſiſſet. Quòd eximantur à morte, erit caſus; neque privilegium paucorum univerſali cauſæ derogat.*

y *Etiam dum creſcimus vita decreſcit.*

z *Vita mea, quantò magis creſcit, tantò magis decreſcit; quantò magis procedit, tantò magis ad mortem accedit.*

a *Naſcendo morimur, imò longè ante nativitatem morimur.*

O Bleſſed Saviour, who art life in thy ſelf, and the fountain of life unto others, Grant, I humbly beſeech thee, that when I ſhall paſſe from this preſent world, from this dying life, or living death, I may evermore live by Thee, in Thee, and with Thee. Amen. Amen.

CHAP. II.

1. *The third queſtion reſumed*, Whether every one muſt die? *The ſecond part of the anſwer unto it*, That ſome have been excepted, as Enoch and Elias. *The controverſie hath been exquiſitely handled by* King *James*, *and* Biſhop *Andrews.*

2. *Bellarmines third demonſtration, that Antichriſt is not yet come, propounded. The place of Malachi* 4. 5. *expounded by Biſhop Andrews: and enlarged by my additions. The Papiſts objection anſwered.*

3. *The place of Eccleſiaſticus* 48. 10. *concerning Elias, examined.*

4. *Another place of Eccleſiaſticus*, 44. 16. *concerning Enoch, handled at large againſt Bellarmine. Enoch was never any notorious ſinner, in ſome mens opinions: Others, otherwiſe. Their arguments for both opinions are onely probable; and anſwered. My opinion: and it confirmed. Some think Enoch died. Strange and various opinions concerning S. John the Evangeliſt, his living, death, and miraculous grave. More miracles, or elſe miſtakings, in the Temples, of Chriſts Sepulchre, and of his Aſſumption, about Jeruſalem. S. John did die. Enoch did not die, but is living. Mine own opinion of the place Geneſ.* 5. 24. Et non ipſe: *and it confirmed. A compariſon between Enochs, Elijahs, and Chriſts aſcenſion. The poſture and circumſtances of Chriſts aſcending.*

5. *Bellarmine and others ſay, Paradiſe is now extant: In the earth, or in the aire, ſaith Lapide the Jeſuit. The old tranſlation cenſured. The heaven, into which Enoch and Elias were carried, was not* Aërium, *nor* Cœleſte; *but* Supercœleſte. *The earthly Paradiſe is not extant, as it was. Salianus with others ſay truly, The materiall remaineth, not*

the

the formal: Supereſt quoad Eſſentiam, non quoad Ornatum: *The* Place *is not removed, but the* Pleaſure, *and* Amenitie. *Salianus his groſſe errour, That Enoch and Elias are kept by Angels, within the bounds of old Paradiſe on earth.*

6. *Enoch ſhall never die, as is proved from Hebr.* 11. 5. *Three evaſions in anſwer to that place, confuted. Melchizedech, and ſtrange things of him. The Eaſt-Indian language hath great affinitie with the Hebrew. An errour of moment in Guilielmus Poſtellus Barentonius. Elias was not burnt by that fire which rapted him.* Soul and bodie concur to make a man, *ſaith Auguſtine from the great Marcus Varro. Vives taxed. Moſes at the tranſfiguration, appeared in his own bodie. An idle conceit of* Bellarmine, *concerning Moſes his face; and good obſervations of Origen upon that point. It is probable, that Elias was changed at his rapture, and had then a glorified bodie. An humane ſoul may poſſibly be in a mortall bodie in the third heaven. Corah, Dathan, and Abiram, are in their bodies in hell, properly ſo called; and alive in the hell of the damned. Ribera and Viegas confuted. Our Doctour Raynolds was not in the right in this matter. Some kinde of proofs, That Enoch and Elias are in glorified bodies in heaven. The place of Revel.* 11. 7. *concerning the two Witneſſes, winnowed by Biſhop Andrews. Enoch and Elias are not thoſe two witneſſes.*

THe main third queſtion being, *Whether all men, and every one muſt of neceſſitie die?* the firſt part of the anſwer was, *That there was no abſolute neceſſitie, but there might be an exception.* The ſecond part of the anſwer touched at, was this; *That ſome have been excepted, who never did die, nor ſhall die.* If I be further demanded, *Who they be?* I will onely inſiſt in *Enoch and Elias.* The controverſie concerning which two men, is ſo exquiſitely handled by the moſt learned Monarch, our late Soveraigne King James, in his monitory Preface; and by his Second, the reverend Biſhop Andrews, in his anſwer to Bellarmine his Apologie, *cap.* 11. that the moſt ſcrupulous inquiſitour may be ſatisfied.

After I have ſelected ſome matters of moment from that unanſwerable Prelate, I will take leave to glean after the gathering

thering of their full ſheaves; and to diſcover a few cluſters, after their plentifull vintage; and to bring to your taſte ſome remarkable paſſages concerning Enoch and Elias, which (perhaps) they thought fit to omit, as affecting brevitie, or tying themſelves moſt ſtrictly to the queſtion; whileſt the nature of my Miſcellanies give me licence to travel farre and neare.

2. Bellarmine, *Tom. 1 de Romano Pontifice 3. 6.* makes it his third *Demonſtration* (as he calleth it) that Antichriſt is not yet come, Becauſe Enoch and Elias are not come; who yet do live, and muſt oppoſe Antichriſt. Bellarmines firſt place, is from Malach. 4.5, and ſixth verſes; *Behold, I will ſend you Elijah the Prophet, &c.* The Biſhop, pag. 255. from Chryſoſtom well obſerveth, that moſt Greek and Latine copies miſreade it thus, *Ecce, mitto ad vos Eliam Theſbitem: Behold, I ſend unto you Elias the Tiſhbite:* and ſo, becauſe the Baptiſt was not Elias the Tiſhbite, we might expect the Tiſhbite after John. Indeed the Septuagint, turned by Hierom, and in Theodoret on Malachi 4. 5. have it, *Eliam Theſbitem*; And *Codex Vaticanus ſo hath it,* (ſaith Chriſtopher Caſtrus on the place) *and all the Greek Fathers, and Tertullian, and Auguſtine de civit.* 20. 29. But in the Hebrew it is not Elias *the Tiſhbite*; but Elias *the Prophet*: and ſo it is in the fair great Bibles of our Adverſaries, of Vatablus, and others. Ribera the Jeſuit is bold (as other Jeſuits were before) to finde fault with the Bibles of Arias Montanus: [a] *In the King of Spains Bibles it is vitiouſly and erroneouſly written, in the tranſlation of the Septuagint,* BEHOLD, I WILL SEND UNTO YOU ELIAS THE PROPHET: as if there had not been diverſitie of copies: and as if thoſe copies which are moſt agreeable to the Originall, were not to be preferred, or were ill and erroneous: as if we were to bring and bend the Originall to the Septuagint; as Carafa profeſſeth to reduce the 70 to the Vulgat.

[a] *Malè atque vitiosè in Bibliis Regiis ſcriptum eſt, in Tranſlatione* 70, Ecce, ego mittam vobis Eliam Prophetam.

There is an errour alſo, ſaith Biſhop Andrews, [b] *When the Grecians in both places reade, that Elias aſcended* AS INTO HEAVEN; *not* INTO HEAVEN, (*which is expreſſely in the Hebrew*) *but,* AS IT WERE INTO HEAVEN. I doubt not but the Biſhop had good ground to write ſo. But the Septuagint of Vatablus on 2.King. 2. 11. hath it, Ἕως εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, *Even into heaven:* ſo alſo it is read by him, on 1. Maccab. 2. 58. with whom agreeth the 70, of Montanus, on the Maccab. ſo alſo Druſius both reades it, and expounds it, ASSUMPTUS EST IN CŒLUM USQUE, *He was taken up even into heaven:* confirming it alſo in his notes on the place. So theſe reade it, not ὡς but ἕως, not *Quaſi* but *Uſque:* which reading affordeth no patrocinie to them, but helpeth our ſides.

[b] *Cùm Græci utrobique legant, aſcendiſſe Eliam,* Ὡς εἰς οὐρανόν *non* In cœlum, (*quod expreſſè tamen habetur in Hebræo*) *ſed,* Quaſi in cœlum.

Biſhop Andrews further proceedeth to this effect; That concerning

concerning the words of Malachi, Christ, both of his own accord (Matth. 11. 10. —) and being questioned (Matt. 17. 10. — and Mark 9. 12. —) affirmed, That that prophesie was compleat; That John did do what Malachi said Elias was to do. And because John came in the vertue and power of Elias, Christ expounding Malachi, saith, *Elias is come*, Mark 9. 13. Brugensis a Papist, on Malachi 4, saith, *What is spoken of Elijah by the Prophet, seems properly to be expounded of John the Baptist.* And Vatablus, *ibid.* saith, *The place is to be expounded of Christs first coming.* So Arias saith, from the wise interpretation of the ancient Scribes, That *The terrible day* hath not reference to the last day of judgement, but to the coming of the Messias; Christ both approving, and proving it. The same Arias interprets *The smiting of the earth with a curse* (Mal. 4. 6.) by laying it waste and desolate, as Judea hath been from the time of Titus.

The reverend Bishop thus recollecteth: Elias was to be sent before the coming of Christ, Malachi 4. 5: Before the first coming none was sent in the spirit of Elias, but John: The first coming is to be understood, and not the second, by the confession of our learned adversaries. Elias was called *the messenger* or *Angel*, Malac. 3. 1. so is John called, Matth. 11. 10, Mark 1. 2, Luke 7. 27. *Elias was to come*, Matth. 17. 11; but, *This is Elias which was for to come*, Matth. 11. 14; and, *Elias is now come*, Matth. 17. 12. *Elias shall turn the hearts of the fathers to the children*, Mal. 4. 6. *John the Baptist shall go before him, in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children*, Luk. 1. 17. Let me adde these things, That Elias is called *the Prophet*, Mal. 4. 5. and, *He shall prepare the way before the Lord*, Mal. 3. 1. So John the Baptist, parallell-wise, Luk. 1. 76. is called *the Prophet — which shall go before the face of the Lord, to prepare his wayes*: Yea, *More then a Prophet*, Matth. 11. 9. S. Hierom, on Matth. 11. draweth out the parallels to more length: *John came in the vertue and power of Elias;* [c] *Elias and John had both the same grace and measure of the holy Ghost, and were equall in austeritie of life, and vigour of minde: Each lived in the wildernesse: each was girded with a leathern girdle. Elias was forced to flee, because he reproved Ahab, and Jezabel: John was beheaded for finding fault with Herod and Herodias.* And yet, to speak truth, the same S. Hierom is not constant to himself; but crossing what he said on Malachi, and otherwhere, he, on Matth. 17. 11. thus expounds these words, [d] EIIAS INDEED IS TO COME: *He who is bodily to come in the second coming of our Saviour, is now come by John Baptist in Power and in Spirit.* Which I much wonder that the two great scholars of the world, either did not see, or would not ingeniously confesse; but towing at the rope of

[c] *Et eandem Spiritus sancti, vel gratiam habuit, vel mensuram: sed & vitæ austeritas, vigorque mentis, Heliæ, & Joannis, pares sunt, &c.*

[d] Elias quidem venturus est · *Ipse qui venturus est in secundo Salvatoris adventu, juxta* corporis fidem, *nunc per Joannem venit in* virtute & Spiritu.

of contention, each of them would have S. Hierom to be wholly on his ſide, when in this point he is on both ſides.

Again, the firſt coming of Chriſt is neceſſarily to be underſtood by Malachi. For *the meſſenger*, and *the covenant whom ye delight in*, are coupled together, Mal. 3. 1. but no covenant, that we delight in, cometh at the ſecond coming of Chriſt, but did come at the firſt approach of the Meſſias, even the covenant of peace. Moreover, what *offerings of Judah and Jeruſalem ſhall be pleaſant to the Lord, as in the dayes of old, and as in former yeares*, Malach. 3. 4? ſhall ſuch offerings be after Chriſts ſecond coming? And, if ſuch were; yet after all this, he ſaith, Mal. 3. 5. *Chriſt will come neare to you to judgement*; Shall we have an other judgement after the ſecond, which the Spirit of God calleth the *Eternall judgement*, Heb. 6. 2. and is the laſt judgement, by an univerſall agreement? Beſides, as the laſt day may be called, and truely is, *a terrible day*; yet the righteous are then to *hold up their heads*, Luk. 21. 28. and it ſhall be a day of *joy* and *rejoycing* to them; though it be *diſmall* to the wicked: So the day of Chriſts firſt coming, though it was accompanied with *good tidings of great joy, which ſhall be to all people*, Luke 2. 10. yet was it alſo a *dreadfull day* to the wicked and diſobedient men; worſe, then if he had never come: and it was dolefull alſo to the evil ſpirits, whom he then vanquiſhed, caſt out, and *tormented before their time*, Matth. 8. 29. triumphing over them in his own perſon, and trampling them down, and breaking them in pieces with his rod of iron, in their own kingdome: and therefore may juſtly be called, in reſpect of them, *a terrible day*. The Prophets teſtimonie reacheth home, for confirmation hereof, Iſa. 61. 2. *He hath ſent me to preach the acceptable yeare of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God, to comfort all that mourn.* Which Propheſie Chriſt himſelf (Luke 4. 18, &c.) applieth to his firſt coming, and addeth remarkably (verſ. 21) *This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your eares.* The day of vengeance (you ſee) is threatned in Chriſts firſt coming: And is not the day of vengeance unto ſuch, to whom vengeance paſſively belongeth, a *terrible day?* Which truth is alſo confirmed by that admirable ſimilitude fore-propheſied in the law of Moſes, and applied to Chriſt in the law of Grace; concerning Chriſts being, not onely a *chief corner-ſtone*, 1. Pet. 2. 6. and *the head of the corner*, Pſal. 118. 22. *Elect and precious*, ſaith S. Peter: *a tried ſtone, a ſure foundation*, Iſa. 28. 16. and *for a ſanctuarie*, Iſa. 8. 14. *and whoſoever beleeveth on him, ſhall not be aſhamed*, Rom. 9. 33: But alſo, Chriſt is compared to *a ſtumbling ſtone*, and *a rock to make men fall*, Rom. 9. 32, 33: or, as Iſaiah hath it, *a ſtumbling ſtone, and as a rock to fall upon: — and as a ſnare, and as a net: — And*

many

many ſhall ſtumble, and fall, and be broken, and ſnared, and taken, Iſa. 8. 14. &c. *Whoſoever ſhall fall on this ſtone, ſhall be broken: but on whomſoever it ſhall fall, it ſhall grinde him to powder,* Matth. 21. 44. And is not ſuch a ſtone *terrible* to ſuch as fall on it? or on whom it falleth? and is not that time *terrible,* when it falleth? This is propheſied of Chriſts firſt coming; and ſo his firſt coming is truely ſaid to be a *terrible day* unto ſome.

Laſtly, it is inſinuated, that Chriſt, when he cometh, may *ſmite the earth with a curſe:* which muſt be underſtood of his firſt coming: for after his ſecond coming, after the day of judgement, the earth is not to be curſed, but rather bleſſed: For there ſhall be *a new heaven, and a new earth; -no ſorrow, nor crying, nor pain,* Revel. 21. 1, 4. Upon which reaſons, and others, I have wondred that the divine Druſius ſhould be ſo caught with the Jewiſh fable, as to doubt whether Elias be come, or no. Druſius, in his caſtigations or notes on Eccleſiaſticus 48. 11. thus, [a] *To this day many think and beleeve that this propheſie of Malachi was onely by the Baptiſt in part fulfilled: and they hold that Eliah ſhall perſonally and bodily appeare, toward the ſecond coming of our Lord, before the laſt judgement. Whether theſe things be true or falſe, I determine not: This onely I will ſay, The Jews do as yet, and to this houre look for Eliah to come with their Meſſiah: and of him they have this ſaying, WHEN ELIAH COMETH, HE SHALL TEACH US ALL THINGS.* I reply; What part, what ſyllable in Malachi concerning Elias, was not fulfilled by John the Baptiſt? If many do now beleeve otherwiſe, they are ſuch as are Jews, who neither beleeve the words of our Saviour, who ſaid Elias was come; and therefore think Elias ſhall come, becauſe they think their Meſſias is not come at all: or at leaſt they do Judäize in this point, whoſoever they be that expect the perſonall coming of the Tiſhbite.

Chriſtopher Caſtrus the Jeſuit, on Malach. 4. 8. concludeth, That the true Elias ſhall yet come, becauſe it was the voice of the Jews, and the expectation of the Scribes and Phariſees; who ſaid in the ſame places, that Elias ſhould come [b] *before Chriſts glorious appearing, as S. Hierom writeth on Matthew.* Firſt, I anſwer, that the Jews did expect the coming of their Meſſias, to be glorious in all worldly pomp. Secondly, I call not now to minde, that the Scribes, Phariſees, or Jews, ever expected a ſecond coming of their Meſſias. Thirdly, whereas our Saviour ſaith, Matth. 17. 11. *Elias truely ſhall firſt come, and reſtore all things:* though theſe words were ſpoken after John the Baptiſt was beheaded, yet Chriſt meaneth not, that Elias ſhall come corporally; but in anſwering his diſciples, he propoundeth the objection of the Jews, which they before alledged more briefly, and ſpeaketh according to their opinion: *Elias indeed ſhall come;* and then, in the verſe following, Chriſt ſaith unto his

[a] *Hodie multorum opinio eſt, credentiũ iſtud Malachiæ vaticinium ex parte tantùm in Joanne completum fuiſſe. Hi tenent, venturum adhuc Eliam in propria perſona, ſub adventum Domini, quem vocant alterum, ſive ſecundum; hoc eſt, ante extremum judicium: Quæ vera, an falſa ſint, non decerno: Hoc tantùm, Judæos etiamnum, cum ſuo πλεσμένῳ, expectare Eliam, de quo hîc ſermo eſt: unde dicant, Cùm venerit Elias, ipſe docebit nos omnia.*

[b] *Ante Chriſtum glorioſum, ut ſuper Matthæum aſſerit Hieronymus.*

 diſciples

diſciples thus in effect, by way of correction, *Whatſoever the Scribes ſay or affirm concerning Elias his bodily coming, is not literally to be underſtood; BUT I SAY UNTO YOU, THAT ELIAS IS COME ALREADY.* And what he ſaith to his diſciples here, he ſaith to the people, Matth. 11. 14. *If ye will receive it, This is Elias which was for to come.* He fore-knew that ſome would not beleeve him; and therefore he ſaid, *If ye will receive it, This is Elias*; This John, who then did live, this John *is Elias*; not which ſhall come (this is the expoſition of the Jews:) but this John is that Elias which *was to come*, and now is come, and the propheſie fulfilled. *He that hath eares to heare, let him heare.*

The laſt words (as Hierom well obſerveth) do evince, that the former, to wit, *If ye will receive it, This is Elias*, are myſticall, and hard to be underſtood; no plain ſenſe, or manifeſt ſentence. Whence I inferre, that plain and eaſie it would have been to the Jews, if he would have ſaid, as they did think, That Elias ſhould come bodily; although the Baptiſt did reſemble him in vertue and power, and was equall unto him. But here is the myſterie, That Malachi never intended, that Elias ſhould live on earth corporally, againſt Chriſts ſecond coming: but that the Baptiſt was prefigured in Elias; and whatſoever was propheſied by Malachi of Elias, was accompliſhed by the Baptiſt: and no other Elias to come, but the Baptiſt in vertue and power of Elias, and not according to the outward letter. Here is a myſterie, here is depth, which the [c] *Jews and Jewiſhly addicted hereticks* (as Hierom ſtyleth them) will hardly beleeve.

[c] *Judæi, & Judaizantes hæretici.*

3. Bellarmine, *de Rom. Pontif. 3. 6.* draweth the ſecond and third part of his third demonſtration from two places of Eccleſiaſticus: The firſt is, Chap. 48. verſ. 10. *Who waſt ordained for reproofs in their times, to pacifie the wrath of the Lords judgement before it brake forth into furie, and to turn the heart of the father unto the ſonne, and to reſtore* (or *eſtabliſh*) *the tribes of Iſrael.* Firſt, I may anſwer, Eccleſiaſticus is not held Canonicall, but Apocryphall; even by ſuch as, for the many divine and admirable things in that book, could wiſh (if it were no ſinne to wiſh) that it were truely Canonicall: And Apocryphals are not held ſufficient to ſettle a point of controverſie. Secondly, it may be alſo ſaid, that Janſenius maintaineth, this place evinceth not that Elias ſhall come perſonally; becauſe Eccleſiaſticus wrote according to the received opinion of thoſe times, which, from the words of Malachi, beleeved that Elias was to come in his own proper perſon. Bellarmines reply upon Janſenius, is ſhallow in this point, ſaying, [d] *If Janſenius ſaith truth, it followeth that Eccleſiaſticus hath erred, and writ ſome falſe things:* as if he, who writeth the opinion of others, may not relate an errour, and

[d] *Si ità eſt, ut Janſenius dicit, ſequitur Eccleſiaſticum errâſſe, & falſa ſcripſiſſe.*

and write falſe things; though he erre not himſelf, nor beleeveth the falſe things. S. Matthew, chap. 2. 6. wrote what the Jews ſaid concerning the place of Chriſts birth; the things were miſcited, and yet no errour or fault in S. Matthew. The Spirit of truth hath written, that *The fool hath ſaid in his heart, There is no God.* Becauſe the fool thought fooliſhly and untruly, God forbid that we ſhould turn fools alſo; and think that the holy Ghoſt did erre, becauſe he truely recordeth an untrue opinion, or an untrue thing, true onely in the relation. This have I ſaid, to defend both Janſenius and Eccleſiaſticus, againſt Bellarmine. Thirdly, I might anſwer, Onely theſe laſt words have the ſhadow of an argument, *To reſtore*, or *to eſtabliſh the tribes of Iſrael:* which becauſe John did not do, Elias muſt do hereafter. For indeed it is but a ſhadow; ſince as John the Baptiſt did *turn the heart of the father unto the ſonne*, (as was before proved) ſo he may be alſo ſaid, *to eſtabliſh*, or *reſtore the tribes of Iſrael*; not to any temporall kingdome, which cannot be proved to be intended by Eccleſiaſticus, (for in Malachi there is *altum ſilentium, not a word ſpoken* concerning this point:) but to the true ſervice of God, from which they were fallen: for he preached unto ſome of all ſorts; of the two tribes, of the ten tribes, yea of the Gentiles. *There went out unto* John, *Jeruſalem, and all* Judea, *and all the region round about* Jordan, Mat. 3.5. and Jordan divided Galilee from Judea: yea Chriſt himſelf came from Galilee to John to be baptized, Matth. 3. 13. And he taught both Publicans and Souldiers, and Herod, and ſome of all ſorts thereabouts, Luk. 3. 13, 14. &c. and thus did he *reſtore*, or *eſtabliſh the tribes of Iſrael.* The Biſhops Bible hath the controverted words thus; *To ſet up the tribes of Iſrael.* So Coverdale. *Ut conſtitueres tribus Jacob*, ſaith Tremellius; according to the Greek, καταστῆσαι, tranſlated alſo by the Interlinearie, *ad conſtituendum:* or as Vatablus, *ad conſtituendas tribus Jacob, to eſtabliſh the tribes of Iſrael.* Many are the ſignifications of the word καθίστημι, but no where doth it ſignifie, to reſtore unto a diſperſed people their loſt kingdome; which is the hope of the Jews, or the expoſition of the Jewiſhly affected: nor is the word καθίστημι ſo expounded otherwhere, either in the Septuagint, or in the New Teſtament, or in any claſſicall Authour. It is rendred uſually, by *conſtituere*; *Reſtituere*, is a black ſwan.

But mine own opinion is, that Eccleſiaſticus propheſieth not, what ſhould be thereafter, *viz.* after the day of his writing, either concerning John, or Elias; but onely relateth what was paſt: and it is an Eulogie, and laudatorie of Elias his worth; as appeareth by the antecedent, and conſequent narratives; where all runnes in terms deſigning out times paſſed and gone, none touching at the preſent tenſe or time, much leſſe at the future: and ſo it can be no propheſie concerning Elias perſonally to come

hereafter; eſpecially ſince there is never a paſſage in Eccleſiaſticus concerning Elias, which Elias did not accompliſh before his aſſumption: and more particularly, he reconciled God to his children the Iſraelites, and turned their hearts to him. Thus did he *reſtore*, or *eſtabliſh the tribes of Iſrael*, in his time: for, 1. King. 18.21. *Elias ſaid unto all the people* (that were gathered out of Iſrael) *How long will ye halt between two opinions? if the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him:* And then by miracle under God, he eſtabliſhed them, or reſtored the tribes to the right religion, from which they were fallen by idolatrie, the fall of all falls fowleſt. Even Bellarmine himſelf expounds *Reſtituerunt, they reſtored*, by *Converterunt, they converted*, in this very chapter: thus farre truely proving, that Zuinglius and Luther were not the Enoch and Elias propheſied of; becauſe Elias was to convert the Jews, and indeed converted many, (as I proved before) which neither Luther nor Zuinglius did, for ought that I have read.

4. The ſecond place inſiſted upon by Bellarmine, is Eccleſiaſticus 44. 16. *Enoch was tranſlated, being an example of repentance to all generations.* The Septuagint have it thus, Μετετέθη, ὑπόδειγμα μετανοίας ταῖς γενεαῖς, *Tranſlatus eſt, exemplum pœnitentiæ generationibus, He was tranſlated, being an example of repentance to following generations*, ſaith the Interlinearie: *Nationibus, to the nations*, ſaith Vatablus: *Ut det Gentibus ſapientiam; that he may give wiſdome to the Gentiles*, ſaith the Vulgat edition, printed by Petrus Santandreanus, 1614; and it hath in the margin *Pœnitentiam, repentance.* But to leave that varietie: the Vulgat is not properly tranſlated; for it is not, Ἔθνεσι, *Gentibus, to the Gentiles*, as oppoſed to the Jews; but γενεαῖς, *Poſteris*, or *Generationibus, to future poſteritie.* And if it were *Gentibus*, as Bellarmine readeth it; yet it maketh the more againſt him, who would have Enoch, and eſpecially Elias, do greater things for the Jews, then for the Gentiles.

Laſtly, it is not ſo much as intended by any word of Eccleſiaſticus, that Enoch ſhall hereafter appeare in the fleſh perſonally, and then die; and be an example of repentance to the Nations: for after he had ſo long pleaſed God and walked with God in this world, and after he was taken by God from amongſt men (and no doubt, much more, then pleaſed God, and walked with God) if he ſhould come again into this world, here to live; ſhould he ſinne again, that he might be an example of repentance? The conceit is vaſt, harſh, and improbable, if the ſuppoſall ſhould have a certain accompliſhment: but that this, and all other controverted points of moment, concerning Enoch, or Elias, may be the better cleared, let us examine theſe queſtions:

1. Whe-

1. Whether Enoch in his life-time, was ever any great ſinner?
2. Whether Enoch did ever die?
3. Whether Enoch and Elias now live in and with their bodies, in Paradiſe?
4. Whether ever they ſhall die; or do live with glorified bodies in the higheſt heavens?

Concerning the firſt, *Whether Enoch in his life-time was ever any grievous ſinner?* Firſt, I anſwer and ſay, I ſpeak not of the firſt Enoch, the ſonne of Cain, the grand-childe of Adam and Eve, in honour and memoriall of whom, *Cain built a citie, and called the name of the citie after the name of his ſonne, Enoch*, Geneſ.4.17. but of the ſecond and younger Enoch, the ſonne of Jared, Geneſ.5.18. of the poſteritie of Seth.

Secondly, I queſtion not, but that this latter, beſt Enoch, was a ſinner; and in his own eſtimate, a great ſinner: and he might have ſaid, and doubtleſſe did ſay in effect, as David did, and as Adam, and all his of-ſpring (except Chriſt) *Have mercie upon me, O God*, Pſal.51.1. and, *Create in me a clean heart, O God*, Pſal.51.10. *O Lord pardon mine iniquitie, for it is great*, Pſal.25.11. And in the ballance of God (ſetting aſide mercie) he might have been weighed, found light, and accounted for a main delinquent. But this is the *Quære*, Whether comparatively, and in reſpect of other men, even of ſuch whoſe lives ends alſo pleaſed God, he was ſo notorious a ſinner, that he alone was the fitteſt example of repentance to ſucceeding generations? My anſwer is negatively: for I am ſure, Adam, and, as I think, Noah, and Lot, and divers other holy Patriarchs, might as well, yea rather, be an example of repentance to future times, then Enoch; eſpecially, if we meaſure ſinnes by the records of Scripture: for the holy Writ hath more amply inſiſted upon their ſinnes, then upon Enochs; and no part of the Canonicall Scripture toucheth at any thing that was extraordinarily offenſive in Enoch; but magnifieth his goodneſſe, Gen.5.22. and his faith, Heb.11.5. Yet, becauſe the divine Writ might omit the offences of Enoch; and becauſe I cannot think that Eccleſiaſticus wrote without ſome ground, let us ſearch what other Authours have conceited, or written, for, or againſt Enoch.

Some think that Enoch, all the courſe of his converſation amongſt men in this world, lived unblameably, and walked with God. Some Jews held, that Enoch was an incarnate Angel; [e] *Whileſt he lived, he lived worthy of praiſe*, ſaith Druſius. Others write, that in his youth he was very wicked; but after repented, and turned heartily to God, redeeming the time. Druſius proveth, that Enoch was a good man ſtill, by theſe arguments. Joſephus, *Antiq.* 1.5. at the end ſaith, *Seth was a vertuous man; and left* [f] *iſſue like himſelf; and they were all good men: therefore Enoch was ſo.* The poſteritie of Seth, according to the beſt

[e] *Vixit, dum vixit, laudabiliter.*

[f] *Nepotes ſui ſimiles.*

hereafter; eſpecially ſince there is never a paſſage in Eccleſiaſticus concerning Elias, which Elias did not accompliſh before his aſſumption: and more particularly, he reconciled God to his children the Iſraelites, and turned their hearts to him. Thus did he *reſtore*, or *eſtabliſh the tribes of Iſrael*, in his time: for, 1. King. 18.21. *Elias ſaid unto all the people* (that were gathered out of Iſrael) *How long will ye halt between two opinions? if the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him:* And then by miracle under God, he eſtabliſhed them, or reſtored the tribes to the right religion, from which they were fallen by idolatrie, the fall of all falls fowleſt. Even Bellarmine himſelf expounds *Reſtituerunt, they reſtored*, by *Converterunt, they converted*, in this very chapter: thus farre truely proving, that Zuinglius and Luther were not the Enoch and Elias propheſied of; becauſe Elias was to convert the Jews, and indeed converted many, (as I proved before) which neither Luther nor Zuinglius did, for ought that I have read.

4. The ſecond place inſiſted upon by Bellarmine, is Eccleſiaſticus 44. 16. *Enoch was tranſlated, being an example of repentance to all generations.* The Septuagint have it thus, Μετετέθη, ὑπόδειγμα μετανοίας τοῖς γενεαῖς, *Tranſlatus eſt, exemplum pœnitentiæ generationibus, He was tranſlated, being an example of repentance to following generations*, ſaith the Interlinearie: *Nationibus, to the nations*, ſaith Vatablus: *Vt det Gentibus ſapientiam, that he may give wiſdome to the Gentiles*, ſaith the Vulgat edition, printed by Petrus Santandreanus, 1614; and it hath in the margin *Pœnitentiam, repentance.* But to leave that varietie: the Vulgat is not properly tranſlated; for it is not, Ἔθνεσι, *Gentibus, to the Gentiles*, as oppoſed to the Jews; but γενεαῖς, *Poſteris*, or *Generationibus, to future poſteritie.* And if it were *Gentibus*, as Bellarmine readeth it; yet it maketh the more againſt him, who would have Enoch, and eſpecially Elias, do greater things for the Jews, then for the Gentiles.

Laſtly, it is not ſo much as intended by any word of Eccleſiaſticus, that Enoch ſhall hereafter appeare in the fleſh perſonally, and then die; and be an example of repentance to the Nations: for after he had ſo long pleaſed God and walked with God in this world, and after he was taken by God from amongſt men (and no doubt, much more, then pleaſed God, and walked with God) if he ſhould come again into this world, here to live; ſhould he ſinne again, that he might be an example of repentance? The conceit is vaſt, harſh, and improbable, if the ſuppoſall ſhould have a certain accompliſhment: but that this, and all other controverted points of moment, concerning Enoch, or Elias, may be the better cleared, let us examine theſe queſtions:

1. Whe-

1. Whether Enoch in his life-time, was ever any great ſinner?
2. Whether Enoch did ever die?
3. Whether Enoch and Elias now live in and with their bodies, in Paradiſe?
4. Whether ever they ſhall die; or do live with glorified bodies in the higheſt heavens?

Concerning the firſt, *Whether Enoch in his life-time was ever any grievous ſinner?* Firſt, I anſwer and ſay, I ſpeak not of the firſt Enoch, the ſonne of Cain, the grand-childe of Adam and Eve, in honour and memoriall of whom, *Cain built a citie, and called the name of the citie after the name of his ſonne, Enoch,* Geneſ.4.17. but of the ſecond and younger Enoch, the ſonne of Jared, Geneſ.5.18. of the poſteritie of Seth.

Secondly, I queſtion not, but that this latter, beſt Enoch, was a ſinner; and in his own eſtimate, a great ſinner: and he might have ſaid, and doubtleſſe did ſay in effect, as David did, and as Adam, and all his of-ſpring (except Chriſt) *Have mercie upon me, O God,* Pſal.51.1. and, *Create in me a clean heart, O God,* Pſal.51.10. *O Lord pardon mine iniquitie, for it is great,* Pſal.25.11. And in the ballance of God (ſetting aſide mercie) he might have been weighed, found light, and accounted for a main delinquent. But this is the *Quære,* Whether comparatively, and in reſpect of other men, even of ſuch whoſe lives ends alſo pleaſed God, he was ſo notorious a ſinner, that he alone was the fitteſt example of repentance to ſucceeding generations? My anſwer is negatively: for I am ſure, Adam, and, as I think, Noah, and Lot, and divers other holy Patriarchs, might as well, yea rather, be an example of repentance to future times, then Enoch; eſpecially, if we meaſure ſinnes by the records of Scripture: for the holy Writ hath more amply inſiſted upon their ſinnes, then upon Enochs; and no part of the Canonicall Scripture toucheth at any thing that was extraordinarily offenſive in Enoch; but magnifieth his goodneſſe, Gen.5.22. and his faith, Heb.11.5. Yet, becauſe the divine Writ might omit the offences of Enoch; and becauſe I cannot think that Eccleſiaſticus wrote without ſome ground, let us ſearch what other Authours have conceited, or written, for, or againſt Enoch.

Some think that Enoch, all the courſe of his converſation amongſt men in this world, lived unblameably, and walked with God. Some Jews held, that Enoch was an incarnate Angel; [e] *Whileſt he lived, he lived worthy of praiſe,* ſaith Druſius. Others write, that in his youth he was very wicked; but after repented, and turned heartily to God, redeeming the time. Druſius proveth, that Enoch was a good man ſtill, by theſe arguments. Joſephus, *Antiq.* 1.5. at the end ſaith, *Seth was a vertuous man; and left* [f] *iſſue like himſelf; and they were all good men: therefore Enoch was ſo.* The poſteritie of Seth, according to the beſt

[e] *Vixit, dum vixit, laudabiliter.*

[f] *Nepotes ſui ſimiles.*

Interpreters, are called *Filii Dei, the ſonnes of God*, Geneſ. 5.2. [g] *Auguſtine accounteth that they were called the ſonnes of God, who pleaſed God.* Hiſchuni alſo, an Authour cited by Druſius, ſaith, *Becauſe Enoch was juſt, the Scripture,* [h] *to dignifie him, uſed a new phraſe concerning him, ſaying, HE WAS NOT.* And, *It is a probable reaſon, that Enoch was not any time ſo ill, as ſome imagine; becauſe he lived with Adam* 308 *yeares, and miniſtred ſo long unto him, as it is in libro JOHASIN*, ſaith Druſius.

On the other ſide, [i] *Some ſay he was light and inconſtant: ſometimes juſt, ſometimes wicked; as is recorded in the great Geneſis* (a book called in Hebrew, *BERESITH RABBA*) *made by one Ibbo:* ſo relateth Druſius in his book called Henoch, chap. 5. If Ibbo had ſaid, *Henochum fuiſſe modò improbum, modò juſtum, That Enoch was now and then wicked, now and then juſt*; I ſhould farre rather have conſented: for every juſt man, except Chriſt, was ſometime wicked. But that Enoch, after he was once juſt, turned to be extraordinarily wicked, I can never beleeve. For the Spirit would never have given him this teſtimonie, that he pleaſed God, and walked with him; if he had after returned as the dog to his vomit, or as the ſow to her wallowing in the mire. Rabbi Levi the ſonne of Gerſom thus, [k] *Enoch walked with God after he begat Methuſalem,* 300 *yeares:* whereby he intimateth that he walked, [l] *Not in the narrow paths of the Lord, but in the high wayes of the world:* and by that account he might be wicked ſixtie five yeares of his age, or thereabouts. The arguments of either ſide are but weak, and may be eaſily anſwered. Seths poſteritie might do ſome notable wicked acts; and moſt heartily repent, and be both holy, and accounted the ſonnes of God. The phraſe uſed concerning his being taken out of this world, evinceth not, that all the former paſſages of his life were juſt. Thirdly, he might live in Adams time, yet not neare him: and he might live with him, and yet not miniſter unto him: and he might miniſter unto him, and yet be wicked before he miniſtred; yea, even for a time whileſt he miniſtred unto Adam. Many godly parents have lived to ſee wicked ones of their of-ſpring: and it may be that Adam converted him not, till after ſome time that he miniſtred unto Adam, and had ſeen evident ſignes of Adams own great repentance and holineſſe.

On the other ſide, Ibbo writeth like a fabler; and his words were before rejected, as improbable. Rabbi Levi, alledging nothing but conjecture, wanteth weight for an argument.

Now, as there is nothing certain, either *pro*, or *contra*; ſo, if my opinion be asked, I ſhall manifeſt my ſelf to think, that Enoch was ſometimes a grievous ſinner; and after, a moſt contrite repentant, and a moſt holy man. My reaſon is, Becauſe I aſcribe more to the books called Apocryphall, then to any

[g] *Filii Dei ſunt, judicio Auguſtini, qui ſecundum Deum vivunt.*
[h] *Honoris cauſâ.*
[i] *Sunt qui inſimulant eum levitatis & inconſtantiæ: nam aiunt modò juſtum, modò improbum fuiſſe. Id relatum in Geneſi magno.*
[k] *Enoch ambulavit in viis Domini, poſtquam genuit Methuſalem, annos 300.*
[l] *Non in viis domini, ſed in viis ſeculi ſui.*

any humane Authour: for they alone are, and have been many hundreds of yeares, joyned with the Canonicall Scripture, and read in all Churches, except the Jewiſh, at ſet times, as well as the Canonicall; as no other writings of any other are. And if no part of them were divinely inſpired: yet were the men that wrote them, both holy and learned; and the Churches of God have dignified them above all other writings.

Now, though the undoubted Canon mentioneth not any evill act or acts of Enoch (as millions of millions of matters are omitted, both in the Old and New Teſtament;) yet ſome paſſages of the Apocryphals bend me to think, that Enoch was ſometimes a great ſinner: for he was an example of repentance unto poſteritie: therefore, in likelihood, his ſinne was exemplarie, and his repentance proportioned in a ſort unto it.

When Chriſt ſaid, John 13.15. *I have given you an example, that ye ſhould do as I have done to you*; the precedent actions demonſtrate, that he ſhewed great humilitie, and brotherly love, to which he exhorted them. When S. James ſaith, chap.5.10. *Take the Prophets for an example of ſuffering affliction, and of patience*; it may be juſtly inferred, that they ſuffered great affliction, and were very patient. So when Eccleſiaſticus ſaith, Enoch was ὑπόδειγμα (which is the ſame word, that is uſed in both the former places) *an example of repentance*; the reſultance is fair; Enoch was a very great penitent; otherwiſe he was unfit to be an example unto others; ſince exemplarie men and actions have alwayes ſomewhat above ordinary in their kinde, and are ſo excellent therein, that they are ſeldome or never out-gone by any that follow them. As the picture (though *taken to life*, as they call it) cometh ſhort of the lively bodie; and artificials of naturals: ſo doth the *exemplatum*, the *duplicate*, or *counterpain*, of the *exemplar*, the *pattern*, or *originall*. We attain not to that perfection which S. Paul had, though he commanded us to follow his example: nor he to the intire perfection of Chriſt, whom S. Paul ſet before himſelf, as the example to imitate.

Let no man nicely inſiſt, that *exemplum* and *exemplar* do differ. I profeſſe, that I weigh not matters to ſcruples, or halfſcruples; but, though I know ſome take *exemplar* for the man from whom the example was taken, yet I uſe the words promiſcuouſly: Enoch was *an example of repentance*; therefore he was ſometimes a great ſinner: ſince as there needeth no repentance where is no ſinne; ſo he is Stoically mad, who thinketh that there needeth as great repentance for ſmall ſinnes, as for great. Degrees of ſinnes ought to have proportionable degrees of repentance. The ſacrifices were more chargeable for hainous crimes, then for little offences. Indeed one may charitably think, that Enoch was no chief delinquent; but did (as

tender conſciences will) repent much, even for ſmaller ſinnes: and an inference may be thus made; If Enoch ſo much repented for a few motes, for ſinnes not unto death; how fit is he to be an example of repentance to us, who have ſinned a thouſand times worſe, and have beams upon beams in our eyes, and repent a thouſand times leſſe? But I rather think, according to the uſe of the phraſe in other places, that his being an example of repentance, proveth, both *primarily*, that he was a chief penitent; and *ſecondarily*, that there was ſome proportion between his repentance and his ſinne. Which I rather embrace, becauſe of another place, *viz.* Wiſd.4.10. *He pleaſed God, and was beloved of him, ſo that living among ſinners, he was tranſlated:* and verſ.11. *Yea, ſpeedily was he taken away, leaſt that wickedneſſe ſhould alter his underſtanding, or deceit beguile his ſoul:* and ver.13. *He being made perfect* (conſummated or ſanctified) *in a ſhort time, fulfilled a long time.*

My firſt obſervation is this, That theſe verſes are meant of Enoch; ſince the Apoſtle ſeemeth to have alluded to the place, Heb.11.5. which I marvell that the learned Holcot and Lyra did not ſo much as once touch at; but apply the words, with violence, to the generalitie; though the narration be in the paſſed time, not in the preſent, much leſſe in the future.

With mine opinion Druſius agreeth, expounding the words of Enoch: and the margin of Vatablus, and of the old Biſhops bibles, and of Coverdales, and of our laſt Tranſlations, do deſigne, and as it were with the finger point at the ſtorie of Enoch. The ſecond point is *in confeſſo, cleare* and *evident*, That Enoch was aſſumed whileſt he was in an holy eſtate. The third, That he was ſometimes wicked; as may be intimated from theſe paſſages:

Firſt, That he lived among ſinners: which all men els did, as well as Enoch, unleſſe the place be meant of notorious ſinners: and though an Abraham may be in Ur; a Lot, in Sodom: yet even both of them in thoſe places contracted ſome corruption. They who walk in the ſunne, are ſomewhat ſunne-burnt.

Noſcitur ex ſocio, qui non cognoſcitur ex ſe:
Who by himſelf is hardly known,
Is known by his companion.

David cried, *Wo is me, that I ſojourn in Meſech, and that I dwell in the tents of Kedar*, Pſal.120.5. The Prophet juſtly complaineth, That he dwelt among *a people of polluted lips*, Iſai.6.5. If one ſcabbed ſheep infect a whole flock, an unſound flock may infect one good ſheep. Sinne is like a gangrene, a leproſie, and the plague; of a ſpreading and infectious nature. *A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump*, 1.Cor.5.6. Chriſt himſelf could not do the good which he would have done, where the peoples unbelief was exceeding, Matth. 13. 58. but he went otherwhere

where, Mark 6.6. There are as well popular ſinnes, as epidemicall diſeaſes; and holy ones have been tainted in both kindes.

Secondly, It is not ſaid, He went out from among the wicked, he ſeparated himſelf, or fled from their ſight or companie, which had been fitting in ſuch dangerous places; but, *God tranſlated him:* it was Gods act, not his.

Thirdly, ſaith the Text, *He was ſpeedily taken away:* preſuppoſe, as Lot was by the Angel pulled out of Sodom by the hand, Geneſ.19.16. or Habakkuk by the hair of the head; or as the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, Act.8.39.

Fourthly, This was done, *Leſt that wickedneſſe ſhould alter his underſtanding, or deceit beguile his ſoul.* [m] *The will of man hath a power to be changed, even till death:* his underſtanding unſetled, and eaſily to be deluded with apparances: the ſouls of men in this περιπατείῳ, *theater of temptations*, ſtand upon the ice, conſiſt *in lubrico, & in ancipiti, in ſlipperie and doubtfull places:* they who *ſtand*, may *fall:* who have *fallen*, may *recover*. He was taken away ſpeedily, to the intent he might not ſinne: which the all-ſeeing eye needed not to have done, if he could not have loſt his ſtation: and in likelihood, would not have done, but that Enoch before that time had both turned and returned, was both bad and good; which, in the laſt place, the thirteenth verſe ſeemeth to confirm: as if his holineſſe had continued but a ſhort time; but yet was ſo intenſe, and ſo conſummate and perfect, even almoſt *ad perfectionem graduum, to the higheſt perfection in this life*; that *in a ſhort time he fulfilled a long time.*

[m] *Voluntas hominis deambulatoria eſt uſq; ad mortem, &c.*

[n] *Enoch was juſt; but apt to return to wickedneſſe: therefore God haſtened to tranſlate him,* ſaith Rabbi Solomo. Procopius Gazæus Sophiſta in his Commentarie on the place, thus; [o] *If then at laſt Enoch pleaſed God, after he had begot Methuſalem, certainly before he begat him, as the Scripture ſaith, God did not like him, nor accept of him: Therefore it is to be aſcribed to Enochs repentance which he performed, that God made ſo much of him, and loved him.* Though Salianus ſaith of this teſtimonie, that [p] *his minde was againſt it:* yet there is no impoſſibilitie, no nor improbabilitie in it; and howſoever it be not apodicticall, yet it is not *inepta, fooliſh*, as Salianus cenſureth it. He addeth, *Perhaps Philo the Jew was of that opinion: for in his book de Abrahamo, ſpeaking of repentance, &c. he bringeth Enoch in, as an example. And it ſeemeth* (ſaith he) *that he followed Jeſus the ſonne of Sirach,* in the words cited: *viz.* Καὶ μετετέθη, ὑπόδειγμα μετανοίας τοῖς γενεαῖς, Eccleſiaſtic.44.16. And though he ſlubbereth over the words and matter (which are to him Canonicall) and ſaith, that *The minde of the Scripture in that place is; that Enoch ſhall be an exemplarie penitent, not as David and Manaſſes, Peter or Mary Magdalene; but as John Baptiſt:* yet, I anſwer:

[n] *Juſtus erat Enoch; at mente levis, ut facilè redire potuerit ad vitam improbam: ideo properabat Deus eum tollere.*

[o] *Si tum demum, poſtquam genuit Methuſalem, placuit Deo Enoch, certè antequam gigneret, ut Scriptura docet, non gratus & acceptus erat Deo. Quòd igitur amore complexus eſt eum Deus, pœnitentiæ, quam egit, imputari debet.*

[p] *Neſcio quomodo animus averſatur.*

First,

Firſt, no Ancient ever ſaid, John Baptiſt was an example of repentance, and did repent of any enormous ſinnes; but was alwayes holy, and moſt auſtere, preventing great ſinnes, rather then repenting; and not ſo much bemoaning his own offences, as dehorting other men, and crying out againſt their iniquities, with a charge, almoſt inforcing them to repentance: whileſt himſelf ſhewed a ſigne of his being ſanctified and illuminated, even in his mothers wombe.

Secondly, there is as much joy over a repentant, and God is as much glorified, for point of mercie, in a Marie Magdalene, or a Peter, as in a Baptiſt, or juſt man, that needeth no repentance; if not more. Procopius Gazæus, who imagined the worſt of Enochs former part of life, till he begot Methuſelah; yet ſpeaketh very good things before, of Enoch, thus; *God reſted on the ſeventh day, when he had made the world;* ¶ *and now the ſame God in the ſeventh generation of the world, aſſumeth (as a ſigne of the ending of an age) I ſay, aſſumed Enoch as the firſt fruits of the reaſonable creature. He was out of Gods favour for a while; but when he pleaſed God, he was extraordinarily aſſumed.* Thus in effect Procopius, which the Jeſuit had not much cauſe to finde fault withall. Let this ſuffice for the firſt queſtion, Whether Enoch were at any time a very wicked man?

¶ *Et nunc ille idem Deus, generatione ſeptimâ, accipit (ceu ſymbolum conſummationis ſeculi) Enochum, ut primitias rationalis creaturæ, &c.*

The ſecond queſtion is, Whether Enoch did ever die?

Divers Rabbins maintain that he did die: So Rabbi Solomon on the fifth of Geneſis. Aben Ezra ſaith, *His death was ſweet, and he felt no pain:* which opinion, the Jeſuit Cornelius à Lapide aſcribeth alſo to Calvin; whether truely or falſely, I enquire not; but the matter giveth me the hint of an excurſion.

Moſes ſaid from God, Geneſ. 6.3. *Mans dayes ſhall be an hundred and twentie yeares*; and Moſes himſelf died, when he was 120 yeares old, Deut. 34.7. David ſaid, *The dayes of our yeares are threeſcore yeares and ten*, Pſal. 90.10. and he himſelf, who prayed to God to teach him to number his dayes, died the ſame yeare (being the firſt leſſer climacterical yeare, after that great one of nine times ſeven, that dangerous threeſcore and third yeare:) for, *He was thirtie yeares old when he began to reigne; and he reigned fourty yeares*, 2. Sam. 5. 4. Both theſe were moſt certain Prophets of their own deaths; and, perhaps, had more eſpeciall reference to their own times; deſigning thoſe yeares out in the more generall, which were more appropriate to their own perſons in particular. Let me adde two heathen examples, by way of imperfect parallels.

That moſt exquiſite work of nature, her glory, pride, and maſter-piece, Julius Ceſar, preferred a ſwift and ſudden death, in his choice, before any other kinde. Suetonius, in

in vita Julii Cæsaris, in fine, thus of him, [r] *When Julius Cesar had sometime read in Xenophon, that Cyrus in his last sickneſſe ordered some things concerning his funerals; he hating so lingring a death, wished that himself might have a sudden and quick end. Again, the day before he was slain, as he was at supper with Marcus Lepidus, a question arising, Which death was most commodious, and to be wished for; Cesar preferred a sudden, unlooked for, and unthought of end.* And sutable to his choice and desire, in that respect, did a sudden and unlooked for end befall him.

Likewise, that wonder of Fortune, that darling of terrene happinesse, Augustus, the successour unto the Dictatour, [s] *Almost as often as he had heard* (saith Suetonius *in Augusto, in fine*) *that any one had died speedily without long pain or great torment; he would pray that the like easie departure might befall himself, and his friends.* And, saith he, [t] *He died according as he always desired, parting, as in a complement, with his most familiar friends;* [u] *and gave up the ghost amidst the kisses of Livia.* This storie hath brought my Miscellanie home to that point, which the Rabbin said of Enoch, That he died without pain.

The New Testament also is thought to afford us such an other example. [x] *It is said of John the Evangelist, that he died without any pain,* saith Holcot on Wisd. 2.5. and by that instance, saith, concerning those who rose about Christs resurrection, [y] *It followeth not, that if they died again, they had or felt any painfull death.* But because of the strange opinions which are held concerning S. John the Apostle, let me enlarge my discourse a little concerning him.

Melchior Canus, *Locor. Theolog.* 7.2. saith, *We may hold, or deny,* [z] *without prejudice to our belief, either that he is living, or that he is dead.* The reason, why some thought S. John liveth, was, because Christ said to Peter, John 21. 22. *If I will that he tarrie till I come, what is that to thee?* Neither doth it satisfie them, that John himself saith, ver. 23. *Jesus said not, He shall not die:* for they expound that exposition, *John shall not die,* namely, till that time that Christ doth come.

Dorotheus, speaking of S. John, hath it thus; *John lived* 120 *yeares: which being expired, he living as yet (the Lord would so have it) buried himself.* The storie is enlarged by S. Augustine, *Tract.* 124. *in Joannem,* thus; *Some report, that in certain Scriptures, though Apocryphall, it is found, that S. John, being in health, caused a grave to be made, and laid himself in it, as in a bed, and presently died: or, as some think, lay down as dead, but not dead; and being thought to be dead, was buried sleeping: and that he sheweth his being alive,* [a] *by the ebullition of the dust of his grave;* [b] *which dust is beleeved to arise and to be forced from the bottome of the tombe to the top by his breath. And truly,* saith Augustine,

[r] *Quondam, cùm apud Xenophontem legisset; Cyrum ultimâ valetudine mandâsse quædam de funere suo, aspernatus tam lentum mortis genus, subitam sibi celerémq; optavit mortem: & pridie quàm occideretur, in sermone nato, super cœnam apud M. Lepidum, Quisnam esset vitæ finis commodissimus, repentinum, inopinatúmq; pratulerat.*

[s] *Fere quoties audisset citò & nullo cruciatu defunctum quempiam, sibi & suis εὐθανασίαν similem precabatur.*

[t] *Sortitus est exitum similem, & qualem semper optaverat, &c.*

[u] *Et repentè in osculis Liviæ defecit.*

[x] *De Joanne Evangelista dicitur, quòd dolorem in moriendo non sensit.*

[y] *Non sequitur, quòd, si iterum moriebantur, moriebantur cum pœna, vel sentirent etiam pœnam.*

[z] *Salvâ fide.*

[a] *Scaturigine pulveris.*

[b] *Qui pulvis creditur, ut ab imo ad superficiem tumuli ascendat, flatu quiescentis impelli.*

guſtine, *We heard not this of light credulous men.* Whereupon he adviſeth, [c] *Let them who know the place conſider whether the earth ſpring up there, ſo as is reported. If it be ſo*, ſaith he, (if the earth or ſand bubble up like water; and, that being taken away, other ariſeth and boyleth up in the room) *it doth ſo, either to commend the precious death of that Saint; or for ſome other reaſon, which we know not.* So farre Auguſtine.

Some ſuch thing, in another caſe, is recorded by S. Hierom. Heare his own words, *Tom. 3. de locis Hebraicis*, out of the Acts of the Apoſtles, [d] *Mount Olivet is ſituated on the Eaſt of Jeruſalem, parted by the ſtream of Cedron, where the laſt footſteps which Chriſt ſet upon this earth, are imprinted on the ground, and even to this day are to be ſeen and ſhewed. And whereas the ſame earth is taken away daily by the beleeving Chriſtians, nevertheleſſe the ſame holy footſteps preſently and immediately recover their old form and faſhion.* Who alſo in the ſame place addeth another ſtrange thing; [e] *Whereas the Church, in the midſt whereof theſe footſteps are, was built of a round form with moſt exquiſite workmanſhip: yet the very top of that Church, as people report, could by no means ever be covered or vaulted over, by reaſon of our Saviours bodily aſcent into heaven: but Chriſts paſſage and way by which he mounted from earth even to heaven lieth open, and is viſible.* But our late traveller M. Sands relateth, *That the footſtep is on a firm naturall rock, and the paſſage open at the ſummitie or top of the temple of the Aſcenſion, is to receive light into that ſacred place. For that is covered as the ſepulchre (or rather, as the temple of the ſepulchre) whoſe round is covered with a CUPULO, ſuſtained with rafters of Cedar, all of one piece, open in the midſt, like the Panthcon at Rome; whereat it receiveth the light that it hath, and that as much as ſufficeth. Juſt in the midſt, and in view of heaven, ſtandeth the glorified ſepulchre.* So farre M. George Sands. M. Fines Moriſon ſaith, *On the top of mount Olivet, the higheſt of all the mountains that compaſſe Jeruſalem, in a Chappel, they ſhew in ſtone the print of Chriſts feet, when he aſcended into heaven.*

It did a little amaze me, that theſe our two countreymen, both being learned, and both being there eye-witneſſes, do differ ſo much: the firſt mentioning a *footſtep*, in the ſingular number; the other, *feet*, in the plurall; (Antiquitie ſaith, *On the Earth*; late Writers, *On a Rock*;) which maketh me rather bear with the good S. Hierom, who relateth from others, that the top could by no means be covered. Open, perhaps, the top was left, and open purpoſely, by ſome exquiſite workmen; whoſe skill ſome credulous ignorants could not diſcern; and they might report, that what was done, could not be done otherwiſe. But of this in either of our countreymen there is not one word. I return to the old matter.

Sixtus

[c] *Viderint, qui hunc locum ſciunt, utrùm hoc ibi faciat terra, vel patiatur, quod dicitur.*

[d] *Mons Oliveti, ad Orientem Hieroſolymæ* [ſitus eſt] *torrente Cedron interfluente; ubi ultima veſtigia Domini humo impreſſa, hodiéque monſtrantur. Cùm* [terra eadem quotidie à credentibus hauriatur, nihilominus tamen eadem ſancta veſtigia priſtinum ſtatum continuò recipiunt.

[e] *Cùm Eccleſia, in cujus medio ſunt* [veſtigia] *rotundo ſchemate, & pulcherrimo opere conderetur; ſummum tamen cacumen, ut perhibent, propter Dominici corporis meatum, nullo modo contegi, & concamerari potuit; ſed tranſitus ejus à terra ad cælum uſque patet apertum.*

Sixtus Senenſis, *Bibliothecæ ſanctæ lib. 6. Annotat. 93.* ſaith, *Many moſt grave and worthy Authours have written, that S. John the Evangeliſt yet liveth.* But Chryſoſtom, *Hom. 66. in Matt.* reporteth, [f] *That he was put to a violent death:* and he bringeth in Chriſt, ſpeaking theſe words to the two ſonnes of Zebedee (of whom S. John the Evangeliſt was one, Mark 10.35.) [g] *YE SHAL DRINK OF MY CUP, & ſhall be put to a violent death, and be crowned with martyrdome, like unto me.* Euthymius alſo teſtifieth, that Chryſoſtom, in two other places, ſaith that S. John the Evangeliſt was ſlain in Aſia: which makes me wonder, that George Trapezuntius (if he be truely alledged by Sixtus Senenſis, *ibid.*) ſhould interpret Chryſoſtoms words, of the martyrdome and violent death which John (forſooth) ſhould ſuffer with Enoch and Elias, under the laſt perſecution of Antichriſt: eſpecially ſince Chryſoſtom ſo punctually deſigneth out the time paſt, and telleth what was done to John, and where.

[f] *Illum violentâ morte obtruncatum obiiſſe.*

[g] Calicem meum bibetis, (*Matth.* 20. 23.) *id eſt, Martyrii coronâ potiemini, & violentâ morte, ſicut & ego, à vita diſcedetis.*

Hippolytus, *Portuenſis Epiſcopus*, in his ſhort Tractate *de mundi conſummatione*, ſaith, *As Chriſts firſt coming had John the Baptiſt his forerunner; ſo the ſecond ſhall have Enoch, and Elias, and John the Evangeliſt.* This compariſon is very lame, and halteth: for it may be applied as well to any, as to John the Evangeliſt. Others uſe not ſo fooliſh a ſimilitude; but yet embrace a wilder opinion: for they ſay, that S. John died, and roſe from the dead, and was aſſumed into heaven. Nicephorus, 2.42. addeth, *DECEBAT, It was fit, convenient, decent and requiſite, that he, who kept Chriſts mother, and was ſo beloved of Chriſt, ſhould be ſo aſſumed, as Chriſts mother was.* O man, how proud art thou, to judge, what is convenient, or inconvenient for God to do!

Baronius, *Tom. 2. Anno Chriſti* 101. *numerô marginali* 2. thus, *Sixtie eight yeares from Chriſts death, S. John died at Epheſus, as Hierom hath it de Scriptoribus Eccleſiaſticis, in Joanne.* And Polycrates, a moſt ancient Divine, writing to Victor, then Biſhop of Rome, as Euſebius hath it, 1. 25. ſaith of S. John, [h] *He died at Epheſus.* Tertullian, [i] *S. John died, of whom ſome conceived a vain hope, that he ſhould live till Chriſt came again.* Euſebius, 3. 33. ſaith, *There were two Johns in Aſia: John the Apoſtle, and John the Diſciple; and both their ſepulchres were at Epheſus.* Chryſoſtom, *Homil. 26. in Epiſtolam ad Hebræos*, ſaith, *The ſepulchre of S. John is manifeſt, as of other Apoſtles:* therefore he ſpeaketh of S. John the Apoſtle: But, [k] *Sepulchres belong properly to them who are dead*, as Baronius well inferreth. So much *obiter*, concerning ſome unuſuall paſſages about S. John, occaſioned by Holcots teſtimonie of the ſtrange relation of his painleſſe death: but this I ſhall by Gods grace handle much more plentifully in my ſucceeding books, wherein againſt Car-

[h] *Epheſi obdormivit.*

[i] *Obiit Joannes, quem in adventu Domini remanſurum, fruſtra fuerat ſpes;* in lib. de Anima, cap. 50.

[k] *Non niſi mortuorum ſolent eſſe ſepulchra.*

dan, and his Indian apples, *the procurers of death without any pain*, as he ſaith; I ſhall (I ſay) under the tuition of the Almighty, prove that the ſeparation of the ſoul from the bodie is painfull: that all death is bitter, in one degree, or other.

And now I return to our Enoch; whom the Jewiſh Rabbin feigneth to have been dead without any pain; againſt whom, and all other Jewiſhly-affected, I hope to demonſtrate, that Enoch did not die, but is now living: Heb. 11. 5. Ἐνὼχ μετετέθη, τὸ μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον, *Enoch was tranſlated that he ſhould not ſee death: Ad non videndam mortem*, ſaith Montanus; *Nè videret mortem*, ſaith the Vulgat. The end, why he was tranſlated, was, that he might not die: and the reaſon is annexed, why he did not die; for *God tranſlated him*. Shall God intend to keep Enoch from death: and did he yet die? ſhall God be fruſtrated of his end? ſhall things come to paſſe contrary to his will? where is then his Omnipotencie? It holds firmly, *God tranſlated Enoch, that he ſhould not ſee death; therefore he died not, but liveth as yet.*

A ſecond argument (though not ſo ſharp-pointed) is this; Of the other Patriarchs it is ſaid, *They died*: ſo it is recorded of Adam, *Mortuus eſt*, Geneſ. 5. 5. of Seth, verſ. 8. of Enos, verſ. 11. of Cainan, verſ. 14. of Mehalaleel, verſ. 17. of Jared Enochs father, verſ. 20. of Methuſelah Enochs ſonne, verſ. 27. of Lamech Enochs grandchilde, verſ. 31. even of the whole holy Genealogie from Adam to Noah, of every one it is ſaid, *Mortuus eſt, He dyed:* except onely, when mention is made of Enoch, and then it is not ſaid, *He dyed*; but it is remarkably varied thus, verſ. 24, *Et non ipſe:* which our later tranſlation hath, *And he was not*: which words, you muſt not take in too ſtrict a ſenſe: for if he had died, yet had he had a being; but conſiſting of ſoul and bodie, we may truly ſay, *He was*. How then ſhall we interpret, *Et non ipſe?* I named you the Rabbin, who expounds it, *He died not with pain, as other men; but died ſweetly*. Others thus, *He was not on earth, after the ſame manner, as he was before*. This is true, and well ſtrengthened, Eccleſiaſticus 49. 14. *Upon earth was no man created like Enoch; for he was taken from the earth; DE TERRA SUBLIMIS ASSUMPTUS EST, He was lifted up on high from the earth*, ſaith Vatablus. This is alſo certain, that from the divers expreſſions uſed concerning Enoch, and of others, in the ſame Chapter, that were not tranſlated but died, there is more ſignified of Enoch, then of others; and in that ſpeciall unuſuall phraſe ſome ſpeciall unuſuall thing is involved concerning Enoch; But no ſpeciall unuſuall thing is ſpoken, if it be onely meant of him, as it is of others, that he died: Therefore certainly Enoch died not.

I will not recount more diverſitie of opinions; In all humbleneſſe,

bleneſſe I will preſent before you mine own conjecture. Firſt, I ſay that there is an *hiatus* in the Hebrew; and ſomewhat to be underſtood. The Spirit would leave ſome things doubtfull, and put us to the ſearch. Secondly, a ſupply muſt be made one way or other, if we will fix any ſenſe on the place. Thirdly, I would have wary, and probable ſupplements; not of imagination, and aire onely. Scaliger, *Exercitat.* 81. *Parag.* 2. ſaith thus, [e] *In the tables which Moſes brake, one halfe of the letter Samech was in the utmoſt brink of the table, the other part of it was ſeen in the aire.* Or els Scaliger told an untruth, ſay I: give me fair likelihood, and not the vaſtnes of a phanſie. Fourthly, I ſay, the words, *Et non ipſe*, may commodiouſly be thus interpreted, *He was not found.* If any one ask, where I finde ground for this Commentarie; I anſwer, firſt, it is in the ſeventy, Geneſ. 5. 24. καὶ οὐχ ηὑρίσκετο· *Non apparuit*, ſaith the Interpreter, in Vatablus; or, as himſelf commenteth, *Nuſquam comparuit*: but it is better rendred, *Non eſt inventus, He was not found.* And ſo it is rendred Hebr. 11. 5. where S. Paul hath taken the ſame words, letter for letter, from the seventie, (whoſe authoritie, by themſelves conſidered, I eſteem ſomewhat above the ordinary humane) and made them divine; *By faith Enoch was tranſlated, that he ſhould not ſee death; And was not found, becauſe God had tranſlated him.*

[e] *In tabulis Moſis fractis, dimidiati Samech pars altera erat in extrema ora tabulæ, altera in aere videbatur.*

Concerning Enoch, theſe things I do further obſerve with ſome of the Fathers, with Aquin, and Cornelius à Lapide; That he was a type of Chriſt; ſo alſo was Elias: and both their raptures, or tranſlations, were figures of Chriſts aſcenſion. Again, Hebr. 11. 5. *Enoch, before his tranſlation, had this teſtimonie, that he pleaſed God.* He did not onely pleaſe God; but it was publiſhed, and proclaimed, and, as it were, letters teſtimoniall from heaven, or a divine certificate was made, that he pleaſed God. And therefore I hold it very probable, that as Elijahs aſſumption was known before-hand to *the ſonnes of the Prophets, that were at Beth-el*, 2. Kings, 2. 3. and to *the ſonnes of the Prophets, that were at Jericho*, verſ. 5. as well as to Eliſhah himſelf; ſo was the tranſlation of Enoch alſo, known to thoſe of his time, unto whom God teſtified that Enoch pleaſed him. And it is conformable alſo to the Antitype; becauſe Chriſt before told his Diſciples concerning his departure, John 14. 28, &c. John 16. 5, &c. and verſ. 16, &c. and more punctually, concerning his aſcenſion, John 20. 17. *I am not yet aſcended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and ſay unto them, I aſcend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God.* Which words Chriſt ſpake, after his reſurrection from the dead, unto Mary Magdalen. Yea further, let me expatiate, in ſhewing the correſpondence between Enoch in the law of *Nature*, and Elias in the law of

Moſes, and our all-glorious Saviour in the law of *Grace*. Even as Eliſhah ſaw the carrying up of Eliah 2. Kings, 2. 12. yea, and fifty men of the ſonnes of the Prophets beheld the ſame, (as it is likely 2. Kings, 2.7,15, and 16 verſes:) ſo it may very well be, that God was pleaſed to give bodily ſight, and evidence of Enoch, at his tranſlation, to thoſe unto whom he gave teſtimonie before his tranſlation, that he pleaſed God. And even this fraction the ſubſtance of our Saviours aſcenſion doth ſtrengthen and enlighten. For, *He was ſeen*, not onely after his reſurrection, *of Cephas; then of the twelve: after that, he was ſeen of above* 500 *brethren at once*, 1. Corinth. 15. 5, &c. but in the act of his aſcenſion, Act. 1. 9. *While they beheld, he was taken up, and a cloud received him out of their ſight:* And, *they looked ſtedfaſtly toward heaven, as he went up*, verſ. 10. They ſtood *gazing up into heaven*, and they did ſee him *go into heaven*, verſ. 11.

If any one be ſo curious to enquire, in what poſture Chriſt was ſeen aſcending; I think it is pointed at, Luk. 24. ver. 50, &c. *He lift up his hands, and bleſſed them: And it came to paſſe, while he bleſſed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven:* Ἐν τῷ εὐλογεῖν· [f] *Before he had finiſhed his bleſſing*, ſaith Lucas Brugenſis, on the words. The bleſſing which he began upon them, and with them, with words and geſture, he continued aſcending; that is, with his hands lifted up, not ſo much upright to heaven, whither, perhaps, his heart, hands, and eyes were ſent in prayer to God a little before (for prayer is a prime part of all ſpirituall bleſſing;) but with his hands lifted up over the Apoſtles; [g] *Not in a poſture, as if he were praying to God; but as if he were diſperſing his grace, and pouring out a bleſſing.* So * *Aaron lift up his hands toward the people, and bleſſed them.* So Simon the ſonne of Onias uſed a moſt ſolemn form of holy ſervice and benediction, Ecclus. 50. 20. where it is ſaid, *He lifted up his hands over the whole congregation of the children of Iſrael, to give the bleſſing of the Lord with his lips:* And his lips conveyed it by his hands towards them into their hearts, by a Miniſteriall Sacerdotall exhibition. Thus, Ἀνεφέρετο, [h] *Chriſt was taken, not as birds flie, or as men go: but ſo, as if he had been carried in mens hands, and by little and little lifted upward*, ſaith Brugenſis: [i] *With an upright poſture of bodie leaſurely aſcending into heaven*, ſaith Barradius. Ἀνεφέρετο, [k] *He was mounted, not by any other outward help, but his own power*, ſaith Cajetan: [l] *Either as he was God: or elſe by the agilitie which is proper to glorified humane bodies*, ſaith Barradius. Yet Aquin well obſerves, that as Chriſt is ſaid to riſe by his own power, and yet he was raiſed by the Father; becauſe their powers are one: ſo may he be ſaid to aſcend by his own power, and yet be elevated, or aſſumed by the Father. [m] *He moved not* (ſaith Cajetan) *leg after*

[f] *Dum benedictionem nondum abſolviſſet.*

[g] *Non habitu precantis Deum, ſed habitu quaſi impartientis & infundentis benedictionis gratiam.*
* Levit. 9. 22.

[h] *Suſtollebatur*, vel ferebatur, *non volantis more, aut gradientis; ſed ità ac ſi aliorum manibus geſtatus, & paulatim ſurſum portatus fuiſſet*

[i] *Corporis ſtatu recto, paulatim in cœlos tendens.*

[k] *Ferebatur, non alieno adminiculo, ſed propriâ virtute.*

[l] *Vel per potentiam divinam, vel per agilitatem, dotem humanitatis.*

[m] *Elevatus eſt in cœlum, non ſcandendo gradiens, ſed totus ſimul elevatus eſt.*

ter leg, nor ſeemed to climbe, or go: but all parts alike, and he wholly together was lifted up. And, for the greater Majeſtie, a cloud received him, *Deſcending even to his feet, in the form of a Throne, on which he ſat,* ſaith Abulenſis. *As the royall Chariot declareth the King; ſo* (ſaith Chryſoſtom on Acts 1.) *there was ſent to Chriſt, REGALE VEHICULUM:* which cloud was rather carried up by Chriſt, then he by it. When Aquinas ſaith, *part.3. quæſt.57. artic.4.* [n] *Chriſt uſed not the cloud as men uſe a coach or chariot, to help them in their want.* I underſtand him of *ADMINICULUM NECESSARIUM, A neceſſary ſupport or ſtay* (for Chriſt had no need of ſuch an one:) yet it might be *ADMINICULUM SOLENNE, A ceremonious aid, and ſolemne free aſsiſtance:* he might aſſume it as a token of his Majeſtie: [o] *There was ſeen the ſigne or ſeal of his Divinitie,* ſaith Aquin himſelf. Nor is it againſt the glorie of Chriſts Divinitie, to make uſe of a cloud, or clouds. *He ſhall come with clouds,* Revel. 1.7. *With the clouds of heaven,* Dan. 7.13. *In the clouds of heaven,* Matth.24.30. *This ſame Jeſus which is taken up from you into heaven, ſhall ſo come, in like manner as ye have ſeen him go into heaven,* ſaith the Angel, Act. 1.11. This one cloud might be ſo great, as many leſſer clouds when he aſcended; as all the clouds ſhall be, in which he ſhall deſcend at his ſecond coming: or elſe, more clouds were about him; but one more eminent, on which he ſat, and with which he aſcended. And the extraordinarineſſe of this cloud might teſtifie his Divinitie; in which regard, to diſcriminate him from his forerunners, the Apoſtles *worſhipped him,* Luk.24.52. which was not, in any likelihood, performed to Enoch or Elias: for they were not carried up in a cloud or clouds. But *there appeared a chariot of fire, and horſes of fire: — and Elijah went up by a whirlwinde into heaven,* 2. King. 2.11. To which is added the fiery nature of the whirlwinde it ſelf, Ecclus, 48.9. *He was taken up in a whirlwinde of fire.* The manner of Enochs aſſumption, I confeſſe, is uncertain. Aquila his Alphabet ſaith, [p] *God took up Enoch in a whirlwinde, as he did Elias:* So ſaith Rabbi Menachem, and the Zoar, on the fifth of Geneſ. Druſius in his *Henoch, cap.*13. ſaith, לקח אתו אלהים, *Tulit eum Deus, God took him,* (which are the exact words of Scripture, concerning Gods taking away of Enoch, Geneſ.5.24. both in the fair Hebrew Bibles of Stephanus in *octavo*, and in the Interlinearie, and in Vatablus; though Druſius a little varie the middle word אותו) [q] *by a Jewiſh gamboll, is all one with* ברוח סערה העלהו, [r] *In a tempeſtuous winde did he make him to aſcend:* including an intimation, that in a whirlwinde they were both rapted. If the Scripture had uſed the very words in deſcribing the nature of Elias, I ſhould the ſooner have liked the conceit; but the Rabbinicall ſpeculations conclude not; therefore I will.

[n] *Nubes non præbuit adminiculum Chriſto, per modum vehiculi.*

[o] *Apparuit ſignum Divinitatis.*

[p] *Deus ſubduxit Enoch in turbine, ſicut Eliam.*

[q] *Sanè in Gematria valet,* [r] Cum vento tempeſtatis aſcendere fecit eum.

Laſtly, it is improbable, but divers of the Diſciples or Apoſtles who ſaw Chriſts aſcending, might, and would have ſought and looked for him; but that they were, in a ſort, dehorted by two Angels, who told them, That Chriſt was taken from them into heaven, Act. 1.11. and therefore it was vain to ſeek him any longer on the earth. And moſt certain it is, that when the ſonnes of the Prophets ſaw Elijah ſnatcht up, and Eliſhah parting Jordan with Elijahs mantle; they ſaid unto Eliſhah, *There be with thy ſervants fiftie ſonnes of ſtrength; let them go, we pray thee, and ſeek thy maſter*, 2. Kings 2. 16. and accordingly, *they ſent fiftie men, and they ſought three dayes, but found him not*, verſ. 17. Semblably, we may well imagine, that ſome alſo did ſeek for Enoch, after he was tranſlated; yea, it approacheth nearer to belief, then to imagination, upon this fair reſultance; *He was not found*, ſay the Septuagint; *He was not found*, ſaith the Apoſtle: therefore he was ſought after; therefore he was ſearched for: *TU NON INVENTA, REPERTA ES, I have found thee, whom I could not finde when I ſought thee*, ſaith the old Poet: but it is harſh to ſay, *TU NON QUÆSITA, REPERTA ES, Thou art found, and waſt never lookt after.* Finding implieth precedent ſearch, or going after, moſt ordinarily: but Not being found, neceſſarily implieth a former inquirie: Elias was not *found* by Ahab; therefore Ahab *ſought* for him. Enoch was not *found*; therefore they made *enquirie* after him. So much be ſpoken in defence of my Comment upon the words, *Et non ipſe:* which I have ſupplied from the Septuagint, and moſt eſpecially from the Apoſtle, Καὶ οὐχ ηὑρίσκετο, *and he was not found.* And with it, is alſo ended and terminated the ſecond *Quære* by me propounded, *Whether Enoch did ever die:* with its Anſwer, *That Enoch died not, either a ſweet death, or a ſowre; an eaſie death, or a painfull.*

5. The third Queſtion followeth, *Whether Enoch and Elias now live, in, and with their bodies, in Paradiſe?*

Bellarmine is for the affirmative, That Paradiſe is now extant, and Enoch and Elias live in it. More particularly concerning Elias, Rabbi David, in his Comment on 2. Kings 2. reports it, as the common opinion of the Jews, That Elias went with his bodie into Paradiſe, and there liveth in the ſame eſtate that our Parents did before the fall. Others have taken upon them to deſcribe and circumſcribe exactly the place of Paradiſe, in an Iſland now called Eden, not farre from Babylon, as certain Neſtorians of the Greek Church have fabled: I ſay, *fabled*; becauſe millions of learned men, both Heathen, Jews, and Chriſtians, have ſeen Babylon, and lived in it, and round about it, who never had ſuch a thought, or belief, or tradition, ſo farre as may be gathered by any ancient extant records. Of which Paradiſe whoſoever deſireth to ſee more

at

at large, let him have recourſe to my learned friend M. John Salkeld, in his Treatiſe of Paradiſe. I will onely adde ſomewhat, which he omitteth.

Salianus (the great Annaliſt, from the creation of the firſt Adam, to the death of the ſecond Adam, or rather to his reſurrection and aſcenſion) *Ad annum mundi* 987, ſaith, *Cyprian, Ambroſe, Hierom, Tertullian, Gregorie, Epiphanius, and Hippolytus, acknowledging the tranſlation of Enoch and Elias, are ſilent concerning the place of their being. Auguſtine leaves it as doubtfull, and diſputable. Chryſoſtom and Theodoret like not the enquirie. Rupert ſaith, The Scripture is ſilent: neither are the words of Paradiſe, or Eden, in the place of Eccleſiaſticus* 44. 16. *in the Greek text; but onely in the Vulgat.* So farre Salianus.

But indeed, firſt me thinks, that the old Tranſlatour ſhould have been conſtant to himſelf, and adding ſomewhat to the words of Eccleſiaſticus 44.16. ſhould not have added *In Paradiſum*, as he doth, without any ſhadow of ground from any other place: but, *In cælum*; becauſe it is ſo written, 1. Macc. 2. 58. *Elias was taken up into heaven,* Ἦρε εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, *In cælum receptus eſt*, as the Vulgat it ſelf hath it. Secondly, the Jeſuit Salianus is ſomewhat too favourable in that point; for S. Ambroſe, *in lib. de Paradiſo, cap.* 13. ſaith expreſſely, *Enoch was* [r] *caught up into heaven:* and S. Hierom on Amos 9. ſaith, *Enoch and Elias were carried into heaven.*

r *Raptus in cælum.*

Bellarmine, and other Papiſts, diſtinguiſhing *COELUM* into *AERIUM, COELESTE, ET SUPERCOELESTE*, *Aëriall, heavenly, and ſuperceleſtiall*, ſay, *Enoch was carried into the aëriall heaven.* I muſt confeſſe, that the region of the aire, that *Expanſum*, the aëriall orb, is ſometimes called Heaven: *The Lord thundred from heaven*, 2. Sam. 22. 14. *God gave us rain from heaven*, Act. 14. 17. and birds are called *the fowls of the heaven*, Pſal. 104. 12. *The Lord caſt down great hailſtones from heaven*, (Joſh. 10. 11.) *and they were more which died with hailſtones, then they whom the children of Iſrael ſlew with the ſword.* Theſe hailſtones came from the middle region of the aire. I confeſſe alſo, that Enoch was carried up into the aëriall heaven; but with this diſtinction, He was taken into it, as his *way*, not as the *end of his journey*, not as his *habitation*, or *reſting place.* The caſe of Enoch and Elias is ſo like, ſo one in this *puncto*, that you are not to marvell, if ſometimes I uſe the name of one, ſometimes of the other: what is ſaid of one, is meant of both; [f] *Who knoweth one, is not ignorant of the other.* Chryſoſtom in his oration of Elias, is expreſſe, that he reſteth not in the aire: and bringeth in Satan, as wondring at Elias his riding through and above the clouds: neither is his reaſon to be contemned. Elias is not there where the devil is Prince: and what ſhould he do among lightning and thunder, hail, ſnow, ſtorm

f *Qui unum recte nôrit, ambos noverit.*

ſtorm and tempeſt? This is the portion of the wicked to drink. If you flee to the miraculous omnipotent hand of God; why may not I ſay the like, concerning Gods extraordinary clothing him with immortalitie, and that by diſpenſation unuſuall, in the act of tranſlating him? God did not let him continue on the earth, or in the aire; but aſſuming him into the higheſt heaven, did glorifie his bodie. For concerning *cælum cæleſte*, Bellarmine will not ſay that he reſteth there: nor did ever any afford patrocinie to that conceit. Indeed Seneca, *De conſolatione*, ſheweth that the Stoicks thought, that the ſouls of men departed hovered about their bodies, and in the end were carried up [t] *to the ſtarry heaven.* And Cicero, *De ſomno Scipionis*, placeth that heroïcal ſoul among the ſtarres. Beſides that the conceit is heatheniſh, it nothing concerneth our queſtion of mortall bodies. But if Enoch and Elias are in the orbs, and among the ſpheres, which is the *cælum cæleſte*; they ſhould be hurried with diurnall motion, from the Eaſt unto the Weſt: unleſſe you place them upon the Poles, to ſtand there immoveably: which Poles are as imaginary, as their being there. If there they be in mortall bodies; what ſtrange influences would the heavens poure forth upon them? ſince, the nearer the Object is to the Agent, the more effectually the Agent worketh. If they have the ſame unaltered bodies, either in the aire, or in the *cælo cæleſti*; what meat, what clothing have they? The naturall mortall bodie of Elias, yea of Chriſt himſelf, after fourty dayes faſt, was hungry, whileſt he lived on earth. Auguſtine, *De peccatorum meritis & remiſſione*, 1. 3. ſaith, *They either live without meat; or, as Adam did, by the tree of life.* But Cornelius à Lapide renounceth the latter clauſe; ſince Paradiſe, and the tree of life is ſtarved and dead. S. Hierom, *ad Pammachium*, and Epiphanius, *Hæreſ.* 64. ſay, *They live without meat.* The fore-named Jeſuit fleeth to a miracle; and that is alwayes an help at a dead lift: but he dealeth moſt injurioufly with Epiphanius, cutting him of by the ſkirts, and mangling his opinion. The words of Epiphanius are theſe, [u] *They live, ſince their tranſlation, ſpiritually, and not as they were wont to do on earth: their bodies and fleſh are ſpirituall, having no need to be fed by ravens; but are nouriſhed by other ſpirituall food.* If the Jeſuit will grant they have ſpirituall bodies, he will let fall his poſition, and the poſition of his fellows, That Enoch and Elias ſhall die.

I reaſſume the interrupted point, concerning Paradiſe; *Which*, Cornelius ſaith, *was taken away by the floud*; and, *The place continueth not*, ſaith Pererius; directly contradicting Bellarmine: and with Pererius ſtand Salmeron, Sa, Del Rio, and many other. I will help them to this argument: If Paradiſe did, and doth continue on earth, as it was then; Noah, and his familie, and

[t] *Ad ipſos orbes aſtris ornatos.*

[u] *Vivunt ſpiritualiter, & non animaliter, propter tranſlationem; ſuntque in corpore ſeu carne ſpirituali, & non opus habente, ut per corvos nutriantur; ſed nutriuntur alio ſpirituali alimento.*

and all the beasts, might with lesse ado, and more soon, have been brought into Paradise, and there have lived; especially, there being no great distance between the place where Paradise was, and the abode of Noah when he builded the Ark, if Divines aim right. If Paradise had been on earth in Christs time, would not Christ once have gone into it? Or would the Angels, or could they have kept Christ out? Much, very much more might be said; but Salianus hath saved me all that labour, who, pag. 66. of the first tome of his Eccleſiasticall Annals, writeth thus, [x] *It is a folly to think that Paradise is in the highest part of the aëriall orb; or to place it by the moon. The rivers mentioned to be in Paradise, are on earth: how shall wee convey, or transchange them to those places?* And it is easier to say, then to prove, that the Angels kept Paradise from being overthrown with waters.

[x] *Ridiculum est existimare, Paradisum esse in aëre supremo; aut in lunæ concavo collocare: eodémque flumina, quæ in terris visuntur, transferre.*

Thus doth he reconcile those, which said, Paradise is extant; and those, who deny it; with a true and good distinction, as I conceive it, in this manner: *Let us say that the region and soil, the MATERIALE PARADISI, the place of Paradise, is yet extant; for ONE GENERATION PASSETH AWAY, AND ANOTHER GENERATION COMETH; BUT THE EARTH ABIDETH FOR EVER*, Eccleſiastes 1.4. *For, HE LAYD THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE EARTH, THAT IT SHOULD NOT BE REMOVED FOR EVER*, Psal. 104.5. *Again*, Psal. 119. vers. 90. *THOU HAST ESTABLISHED THE EARTH, AND IT ABIDETH.* And saith he, *The place is not farre distant from Euphrates, and Tigris. But the delicacies, trees, elegancie, delight, order and distribution, ordained for innocencie, are decayed; that it is not to be wondred at, if we cannot finde so much as the footsteps of them:* So he. *Perhaps*, saith Eugubinus, *as Jerusalem, and Sion the mountain of God, and the Ark of God; so Eden also* [y] *is grown writhled and wrinkled with age*; He doth well to add, *Perhaps*; for indeed, it is more likely, that it was not *paulatim*, but suddenly, and wholly defaced, when the Angels left the custodie of it, when the floud washed away its beauty, and bemired it, just like to other places. [z] *The same ground and the essentiall place on which Paradise was seated, remayneth still: the beauty, adornation, and delight is vanished*, saith Del Rio: *And the beddes of the rivers are changed; and the fountains break forth in other places; as Gregorius de Valentia well collecteth.* Thus farre, excellently, Salianus.

[y] *Vetustate contabuit.*

[z] *Paradisus quoad essentiam, non quoad ornatum, quem olim habuit, superest.*

Now, as I have approved him for saying, [a] *Let us ingenuously confesse, That that garden of God, is now no where; the extraordinary beauty and commodities are vanished; though the ground thereof yet remaineth:* so have I just cause to laugh more at him, then he did at his fellows for their opinions; since he is so strangely conjecturall, as to say, *We may say that Enoch and Elias*

[a] *Simpliciter fateamur, istum Paradisum planè nullum esse.*

Elias are placed within the boundaries, which invironed Paradiſe of old: and are kept there by the miniſterie of Angels: yet ſo that no man can ſee them: as Chriſt now and then among the Jews made himſelf inviſible. Againſt this I thus argue. Firſt, whoſoever placed Enoch or Elias in Paradiſe, placed them there, as in a place of extraordinary pleaſure and delight. Paradiſe was ever, by all, taken for *locus amœnitatis* κατ' ἐξοχήν, *an extraordinary place of pleaſure*; and accounted the garden of God till now: But *now there is no ſuch unuſuall pleaſure*, ſaith Salianus; Therefore they are not now in Paradiſe.

Even Ariſtotle, *Ethicorum 9. 9.* could ſay, [b] *An happy man is not to be made an Anachoret*; or rather thus, *An Hermite cannot be an happy man.* And in the ſame chapter; [c] *No man would enjoy the whole world, on condition to have none in the earth with him. For man was born for civill converſation.* And, *Pol. 1. 2.* [d] *Man by nature is a ſociable creature.* Whereupon he well concludeth, A bleſſed man is not ſolitary. For [e] *he hath whatſoever is naturall*; but to delight in company is naturall; therefore he muſt needs enjoy it. The great S. Auguſtine, perhaps, met with the ſame place; I am ſure theſe are his words, *De Civit. 19. 3.* [f] *They ſay that an happy life is a ſociable life; which loveth the welfarre of friends as it doth its own good, and wiſheth as well to others as to it ſelf.* Ludovicus Vives, on the place, ſaith, *They were the Stoicks, who ſaid ſo*: but I rather gueſſe, they were the Peripateticks; and Ariſtotle, their cheif Chaunter. Which bleſſed life the heathen meaned not of eternall bleſſednes after the reſurrection, but of a bleſſed naturall life in this world, and on this earth: ſuch an one cannot Enoch and Elias have, though they were in Paradiſe; becauſe they have no more companie of their kinde. Enoch, more eſpecially, had leſſe happines, by this argument (if he be ſuppoſed to be in the earthly Paradiſe) becauſe he was long by himſelf, ere Elias came to him; by the ſpace, I ſay, of above two thouſand yeares.

To the further illuſtration of the former point, I may truly ſay, If Adam and Eve had lived in Paradiſe by themſelves alone, without any other companie, at any other time; I ſhould not much have envied, or wiſhed that felicitie; yea, though he had not fallen, whereby he became *Radix Apoſtatica*, in the phraſe of Auguſtine. Yea, ſuch a bleſſednes there is in communication of happines; that the all-bleſſed, onely-bleſſed, ever-bleſſed Deitie of the *Vnitie* would not be without the conjoyned happines of the *Trinitie*: The *ſinglenes of Nature* would not be without the *pluralitie of Perſons*.

Thirdly, do they ſee thoſe men and women, and their actions, who now live in the bounds of old Eden, whileſt themſelves, in their bodies, are inviſible?

Fourthly,

[b] Ἄτοπον μὲν ἴσως, καὶ τὸ μονώτην ποιεῖν τὸν μακάριον.

[c] Οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἕλοιτ' ἂν καθ' αὑτὸν τὰ πάντ' ἔχειν ἀγαθὰ πολιτικὸν γὰρ ὁ ἄνθρωπος, καὶ συζῆν πεφυκός.

[d] Ἄνθρωπος ὅτι φύσει πολιτικὸν ζῶον.

[e] Τὰ τῇ φύσει ἀγαθὰ εὐδαίμων ἔχει, *Eth. 9 9.*

[f] *Vitam beatam etiam ſocialem perhibent eſſe, quæ amicorum bona propter ſeipſa diligat ſicut ſua, eáſque propter ſeipſos hoc velit quod ſibi.*

Fourthly, here is a multiplying of miracles daily; that Angels ſhall keep them, yet ſo, that they cannot be ſeen. From Enochs aſſumption, which is now above 4000 yeares ſince, have Angels kept him, that he hath not been once ſeen?

Beſides, no one place of Scripture Canonicall ſaith, they are in Paradiſe: and it is ſo farre from a favour, as it is rather a durance and captivitie, if they be kept from all other parts of the world, within the bounds of old Paradiſe; ſince many places are now more delightfull then the place or places whereabouts Salianus himſelf now holdeth Paradiſe to be ſituated. Moreover, Elijah was taken up *into heaven.* Suppoſe that to gratifie Bellarmine, we grant, *Cælum aeriam* is there meant: yet muſt he needs be taken up from the earth, and ſo not abide on earth, in the circuit of old Paradiſe, as Salianus fooliſhly conceiveth. Likewiſe Eccleſiaſticus 49. 14. *Enoch was taken from the earth,* Ἀνελήφθη ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς· ſo Vatablus hath it, and rendreth it, *De terra ſublimis aſſumptus eſt, He was taken up on high from the earth:* the Vulgat hath it, *Receptus eſt à terra. E terra* had been more pithie. When the Apoſtle ſaith, *He was tranſlated,* Heb. 11. 5. was he left on the ſame earth, on which he was before? Or, after he was in heaven did he come again on the earth? It was an excellent and true obſervation of our learned Whitaker, That Bellarmine ſometimes confuting his fellows anſwers, confuteth farre better anſwers then himſelf bringeth. And I will be bold to ſay of Salianus, though he doth juſtly deride them, who make Paradiſe in the aire, as Cornelius à Lapide, and Bellarmine; or in the orb of the Moon, as others: Yet his crotchet is as fooliſh, as any of theirs. For, in what part of Paradiſe were they kept when the floud was? or was not all the earth overflown? The Angels then kept them in the aire; or elſe, by an other miracle, kept the water from over-flowing that place. That the Angels kept people from entring into Paradiſe, I have read: that they kept any from going out of it, and kept them in it, I have not read. [k] *None can ſee them,* ſaith Salianus: They may (ſay I) by the ſame divine power by which they are inviſible; if inviſible they be. Can they be ſeen by none? How was Elias ſeen by our Saviour, and his three Diſciples, at the Transfiguration? Or were all they within Paradiſe? or was Elias out of the bounds of the old Paradiſe, when Chriſt was transfigured on the mount? But theſe and greater inconveniences muſt theſe men run into, who will maintain againſt Scripture, that Enoch and Elias are in earthly or aeriall Paradiſe: that they may uphold an other crotchet worſe then this; namely, That Enoch and Elias ſhall hereafter die, and be ſlain by Antichriſt; and are not [l] *in the higheſt heaven,* which is the laſt queſtion.

[k] *Nemini conſpici eſſe poſſunt.*

[l] *In cælo ſupercæleſti.*

6. Let

6. Let us ſpeak of them ſeverally, then joyntly. Concerning Enoch, the firſt of them who were *rapti*, it ſeemeth to me, that the Apoſtles words, Heb. 11. 5. not onely do reach home to that point, unto which before I applyed them, *viz.* That Enoch died not: but evince alſo that he ſhall never die. For it is not ſaid, *Enoch was tranſlated, that he ſhould not die for a good while*; but *he was tranſlated, that he ſhould not*, or *might not ſee death*: Therefore he cannot, he ſhall not die hereafter; ſince the holy Ghoſt hath expreſſed, and ſigned out the end of his tranſlation, *Nè videret mortem, That he ſhould not ſee death.*

Some may anſwer to that place of the Apoſtle, firſt, *that he ſpeaketh of THE DEATH OF SINNERS: as if he had meant, with the book of* * *Wiſdome, to ſay, NE MALITIA MUTARET INGENIUM EJUS, LEST HE SHOULD BE CHANGED TO THE WORSE: for ſinners are called DEAD MEN, according to that ſaying,* [1] *WICKED MEN, EVEN WHILE THEY LIVE, ARE DEAD*; So farre Druſius. To whom let me adde, that Chriſt ſaith, Luke 9. 60. *Let the dead bury their dead.* And 1. Timoth. 5. 6. *She that liveth in pleaſure, is dead whileſt ſhe liveth.* And to the Angel of the Church of Sardis, the Spirit ſaith, Revel. 3. 1. *Thou haſt a name that thou liveſt, and art dead.* In all which places wicked men are taken for *the dead*: yet in the place of the Apoſtle it cannot be ſo: for he was ſpeaking of the true lives and deaths of Gods Saints. And if the *literall ſenſe* can be admitted, we muſt not flee to the *myſterie*: but here is no inconvenience in the *letter*. Moreover the ſame God, who mercifully placed him in the ſtate of Grace, could as eaſily have kept him ſo, without inflicting death on him. Laſtly, the Apoſtle ſaid, Hebr. 11. 4. *Abel is dead*; and then deſcending to Noah and Abraham, at the 13. verſe, *Theſe all died in faith.* I hope no man will ſay, the word *died* is here taken for *ſinned:* but it is taken literally, that their ſouls were parted from their bodies: So the words, *That he ſhould not ſee death*, prove that Enochs ſoul was not parted from his bodie. Indeed he is one of them that are mentioned between Abel and Abraham; but yet ſingled out by expreſſe words, That *he was tranſlated, leſt he ſhould*, or *might ſee death*: and therefore he is exempted out of the compaſſe of that word *All*, by ſpeciall diſpenſation; and onely Abel, Noah, Abraham, are the *All* there meant.

Secondly, ſaith Druſius in his Preface, *It may be ſaid, the Apoſtle ſpake* [m] *of calamities, croſſes and ſickneſſes, which may be accounted as a death: as if he haa ſaid, Leſt he might ſee death, that is, THE DISCOMMODITIES AND INCONVENIENCIES, WHICH ACCOMPANY DEATH.* For, who are continually *ſick*, are accounted as *dead.* Firſt, I ſay this is a forced interpretation;

* *Wiſd.* 4. 11.

[1] Improbi, dum vivunt, mortui ſunt.

[m] *De morte calamitatum, & ægritudinum; ut ſententia ſit, Nè videret mortem, hoc eſt, ea incommoda, quæ mortem comitari ſolent.*

tation; *Enoch was tranſlated leſt he ſhould ſee death*, that is, *leſt he ſhould be continually ſick*; and, *that he might not feel the diſcommodities, which accompany death*. Secondly, that opinion leadeth Enoch to death, but not the dolorous way to it: which indeed rather beggeth the queſtion, then proveth any thing againſt me. Laſtly, there is no circumſtance inducing us to think, that the Apoſtle, by the word *death*, aimed at the large and extended ſignification of it, for *calamities*, or *ſicknes*. Sure, about Enoch his time, there were no ſuch notable calamities upon the Saints: and the generations of the world were then ſtrong and healthfull.

Thirdly, ſaith Druſius in the ſame place, *It may be ſaid, Enoch died not; becauſe the Scripture, when it mentioneth his rapture, mentioneth not his death: ſo the Jews ſay, Jacob is not dead; becauſe the Scripture uſeth the word of EXPIRING, not of DYING.* This is ridiculous; for, what is *expiring*, but *dying*? Geneſ. 49.33. *Jacob yeelded up the ghoſt, and was gathered unto his people*: doth not either of theſe phraſes, do not both evince that he died? Oh, but the Jews ſay, *Jacob non eſt mortuus*; I am ſure, the Apoſtle, Hebr. 11.21. ſpeaking of Jacob, ſaith, Ἀποθνήσκων, *as he was dying, he bleſſed his children*; or, *when he was a dying*, as it is in our laſt tranſlation. It evinceth, he died within a while after. And I am ſure again, that Chriſt, Luke 20.37. from the teſtimonie of Moſes, proveth, that Jacob died. I am alſo ſure, that S. Stephen ſaith, Act. 7.15. *Jacob went down into Egypt, and died.* Surely theſe crotchets of misbeleeving Jews ſhould not have the leaſt countenance againſt pregnant proofs both of the Old and New Teſtament.

Druſius yet inforceth this third anſwer, thus; *The ſame Apoſtle ſaith of Melchiſedech, Heb. 7. 3. HE WAS WITHOUT FATHER, WITHOUT MOTHER, WITHOUT DESCENT, HAVING NEITHER BEGINNING OF DAYES, NOR END OF LIFE. Wherefore? without doubt, becauſe in Scripture there is no mention of his parents, and kindred, of his birth, or of his death.*

I anſwer. Firſt, If it be ſaid of all, whoſe progenitours, iſſues, kindreds, birth, and death, are unrevealed in Scripture, *that they were without father, mother, deſcent, having neither beginning of dayes nor end of life*; we ſhould have many, very many more Melchiſedechs in thoſe reſpects; Demetrius the ſilverſmith, and Alexander the copperſmith, and troups of the wicked; Daniel, Sidrach, Miſach, and Abednego; Nathanael, and Joſeph of Arimathea; S. Mark, and S. Luke, and divers others. For, what mention is there of their parents, their children, their genealogies, their birth-dayes, or of their death-dayes, in the ſacred Writ? Therefore theſe words may be ſaid of Melchiſedech, without any reference at all to that reaſon:

and the words may not be ſaid of others, though the divine Scripture omitteth as much, as it did of Melchiſedech.

Secondly, if we grant, that it is in part the reaſon, why he is ſaid to be ἀπάτωρ, *without a father*, &c. yet it may be ſaid alſo, becauſe no other record, before S. Pauls time, no ſacred or profane Authour, no tradition, no book Apocryphall, hiſtorified his parents, or iſſue (ſo farre as yet appeareth:) And becauſe S. Paul, who knew the names of Jannes and Jambres ſome ſuch way, or by revelation immediate, and by no ſuch way knew Melchiſedechs pedegree, he might ſay as he did.

Thirdly, Eraſmus ſaith, *Melchiſedech came of obſcure parents, not worthy to be named.* Before him, Euſtatius Antiochenus ſaid the ſame: and perhaps it may be a reaſon why David called his Nephews, Joab and Abiſhai, *the ſonnes of Zeruiah*, 2. Samuel, 19.22. (for Zeruiah was Davids own ſiſter, 1. Chron. 2. 16.) and omitted their father, for his unworthineſſe; yea, the Divine hiſtorie, where David is ſilent, often mentioneth Joab and Abiſhai, with the addition of their mothers name; but alwayes omitteth the fathers name. This I cannot think to be Melchiſedechs caſe: for being a King, and ſo glorious a Prieſt, both in one; it is moſt unlikely, that he had obſcure and poore parents: yet he might deſcend from curſed Cham; as well as Chriſt, from Moabitiſh Ruth, or from Rahab the harlot of Canaan.

Fourthly, the Jews ſay, *He was a baſtard:* But it is ſooner ſaid, then proved; for never baſtard attained as called by God, to thoſe two higheſt conjoyned titles, of *King* and *Prieſt*. Many men have thought him to be Noah; and more, to be Sem, Noahs ſonne; as ſome Jews; Lyra, and Abulenſis: when indeed he can be neither. [n] *Some very fooliſhly think that Sem was Melchiſedech* (ſaith Procopius:) *But that is impoßible: for when I ſet down his genealogie, it appeareth that he lived not to the time of Terah, or Thara*, Geneſis 11. 24. So he: who hitteth the truth, that Melchiſedech was not Sem: but is out in the genealogie; for both Noah and Sem lived in Abrahams time. See Cornelius à Lapide, on the Hebrews; and the learned Helvicus. *Noah*, ſaith Helvicus, *died the 57 yeare of Abraham; and Sem out-lived Abraham.*

[n] *Quidam admodum ſtultè opinantur, Sem eſſe Melchiſedechum: Verùm id impoſſibile eſt: ſuprà enim, cùm ejus genealogiam explicaremus, patuit, quòd nec Tharræ tempora aſſequi potuit.*

That neither Noah nor Sem could be Melchiſedech, is demonſtrable from Hebr. 7. 6. Melchiſedechs deſcent, or pedegree is not counted, ſaith the Apoſtle, Hebr. 7. from Levi, or Abraham, or their Progenitours, who came from Arphaxad, the ſonne of Sem, the ſonne of Noah. Secondly, both Noah, and Sem, and their genealogie and generations, are perfectly and exactly ſet down: but Melchiſedech is without deſcent, or pedegree, or genealogie, Hebr. 7. 3. *as undeſcribed*, ſay they. Thirdly, we know, Sems father was Noah; Noahs father was Lamech;

Lamech; but Melchiſedechs father is not known. Fourthly, Noah died, Geneſ. 9. 29. and Sem lived not 603 yeares, as it is apparent, Geneſ. 11. 10, &c. Helvicus maketh his death fall on his ſix hundredth yeare; but there is no end known of Melchiſedechs dayes. Origen, in likelihood, fore-ſeeing the inconveniences accompanying the fore-recited, and commonly received opinion, inventeth a new trick, That Melchiſedech was an Angel. After him ran Didymus. But no Angel was ever a temporall earthly King: no Angel was ever a Prieſt, offering up bread and wine, and receiving tithes; or had an order of Prieſthood annexed to any of them: no Angel had ever pedigree from Abraham, or any other. But Melchiſedech, though he had none at all from Abraham or his aſcendents, none at all mentioned in any authentick records or tradition; yet had he one or other; of which hereafter.

There was one Theodotus, ſaith [o] Tertullian, *and he brought in a novel opinion, and held, That what Chriſt doth for men, Melchiſedech doth for the Angels.* But this cannot be; for the good Angels needed not any Mediatour of Redemption; no, not Chriſt himſelf; nor ever had, nor ever ſhall have. This Arch-heretick had other Melchiſedechians, who taught, that Melchiſedech was a certain vertue, or power, greater then Chriſt; becauſe Chriſt is ſaid to be a Prieſt according to his order: So Epiphanius relateth, *lib. 2. Hæreſ. 55.* Yet this holdeth not for the *majoritie*, or *betternes*; but for the *prioritie*, or *typicall reſemblance*.

Some have held, that Chriſt was a Prieſt according alſo to the order of Aaron; and then, by that argument, the Aaronicall Prieſthood ſhould be better then Chriſts; which is plainly confuted in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews. Chriſt accompliſhed every type of him, and according as they ſignified, did he fulfill: This doth not prove their betternes, or efficacie, greater then his: no more doth his being a Prieſt according to the order of Melchiſedech, either magnifie Melchiſedech above Chriſt, or any way vilifie Chriſt.

Varietie of conjectures have been manifold; I hold it probableſt, with Joſephus the Jew, with divers late Writers, with the ancient Fathers, [p] Dionyſius, [q] Epiphanius, [r] Theodoret, Procopius and others, that Melchiſedech was one of the Kings of Canaan, and came from Cham, not from Sem. And this God might ordain purpoſely, that the Gentiles might not deſpair of ſalvation: but, though Chriſt came of the ſeed of Abraham, and the Jews were Gods peculiar people; yet Chriſt himſelf was a Prieſt according to the order of Melchiſedech, who deſcended from the curſed ſeed.

That Melchiſedech was the holy Ghoſt, was a mad opinion, now forſaken of all. That he was not an Angel, nor a vertue greater then Chriſt, I proved before: but a man, a meer man;

o *De præſcriptione, cap. 53. in fine.*

p *Cæleſtis Hierarchiæ cap. 9.*
q *Hæreſ. 51.*
r *In Geneſ. quæſt. 63.*

man: whoſe pedigree is not to be reckoned from Abraham, or his predeceſſours: for Abrahams predeceſſours dwelt in *Ur of the Caldees*, Geneſ. 11. 28, and 31. and, *Your fathers dwelt on the other ſide of the floud in old time*, Joſhuah 24. 2. that is, Beyond Euphrates Eaſtward, even unto the Eaſt-Indies, did Sems poſteritie reach and multiply; propagating true religion, with the hiſtories both of the Creation, and of the Deluge. In the Eaſt-Indian *Shaſter* (which is the Canon of their devotion, eſteemed by them, as the ſacred Bible is by us) there are now many fables intermixed, ſavouring more of humane invention, then of faith: yet their rationall traditions make nearer approaches to the divine truth, concerning the creation, then the more ignorant Theologie of the Romanes, till Chriſts time; and as good laws and precepts have the Eaſt-Indians, for moralitie, and government Oecomenick and Politicall, if not better, for a ſettled State. And I hold it a moſt remarkable thing, that the Eaſt-Indian language, to this day, hath farre more affinitie with the Hebrew, then any one of our Occidentall languages; yea, then all of them put together. And thoſe *Indi Auroræ*, or, as one calleth them, *Indi Diei*, have ſcarce a word, but it is found in the Caldee, Arabick, or primitive Hebrew: and by perfect knowledge in the Hebrew, one may eaſily attain to the knowledge of all other the Eaſtern tongues. Whence we may conclude the prioritie of the Hebrew tongue. See the learned William Poſtell, in his alphabet of twelve tongues, different in characters: and more ſpecially *de Indica lingua*. One great errour I cannot omit in the ſaid learned Poſtellus, in his Tractate *de lingua Samaritana*; for, from S. Hierom, *in proœmio libri Regum*, and with him, he maintaineth, that it is certain that Eſdras, after the inſtauration of the temple under Zerubbabel, invented other letters, which now we uſe; and that the characters of the Samaritans and Hebrews were all one till then: and withall, himſelf found out a very probable ſpecious reaſon, why Eſdras ſhould forſake the old characters, and framed new: and yet he bringeth in the characters of Hebrew now in uſe, as delivered by God in the tables given to Moſes: whereas (if he would be conſtant to himſelf) either God gave to Moſes the Samaritan letters, and Eſdras invented new ones: or, if God gave theſe now in uſe to Moſes, the Samaritans may be thought to invent new characters, that they might differ from the Hebrews, and make their ſchiſm more irreconcileable, by the ſtrangneſſe of misfigured letters. Moſes was farre more ancient then Eſdras; and the Samaritans, who received no Scripture but Moſes his writings, in all likelihood uſed the letters and characters uſed by Moſes: and ſo, in concluſion it will ariſe, that the Samaritan letters and the Hebrew were all one a long time; which Poſtel-

lus

lus confeſſeth: and that they were exactly the ſame which God gave to Moſes; which Poſtellus denieth: and after that, Eſdras might invent new characters, upon the ground which Poſtellus framed, and the Jews (as he ſaith) approved: and theſe commonly we enjoy. I cannot omit, that you ſhall finde other characters of the alphabet of that language which was uſed beyond Euphrates, different from the Samaritan, but more from the Hebrew: And it is in the Hebrew Grammar of Abraham de Balmis, [q] *As I found* (ſaith he) *in a moſt ancient book*: and he ſaith, *It was* [r] *the writing uſed beyond Euphrates.* The characters of both which, I would have deſcribed exactly, if I had been ſure our Printers had the ſtamps; for others have not: In regard of which defect, Mr Selden, in the preface to his book called *Marmora Arundeliana*, excuſeth his printing of the Samaritan, the Syriack, and Arabick words and paſſages uſed in his Commentarie, by the Hebrew letters, rather then by their own proper characters.

[q] *Prout inveni in libro vetuſtiſſimo.*
[r] *Scriptura tranſitus fluvii.*

I am come back to Jeruſalem, where Melchiſedech reigned. And though he was a moſt holy man, and an extraordinary type of Chriſt; yet, I ſay, he came of the curſed ſeed. For Cham poſſeſſed all Canaan; and it was called the land of Canaan, from Canaan the ſonne of Cham. And he was one of the Kings in that land: for it had many Kings, Geneſ. 14. Melchiſedech, and Job, and many other, in the old Teſtament, do prove, that God was not the God of the Jews onely, but alſo of the Gentiles.

This place of the Apoſtle, Hebr. 11. 5. concerning Enoch, *Nè videret mortem*, hath occaſioned much diſcourſe; but I cannot leave Enoch yet. Indeed it is ſaid, Geneſ. 5. 24. *God took him*; [s] *that is, God ſent for him by death*, ſaith Aben Ezra: and ſo the word לקח is taken, Ezechiel 24. 16. [t] *Behold, I take away from thee the deſire of thine eyes.* Salmanticenſis Judæus, *in lib. Johaſin*, 98. 2. ſaith, [u] *Rabbi Emmi died: for death ſnatched him away.* And ſo it is in the Latine phraſes, *Rapio*, and *Aufero*, what in the Hebrew is לקח.

[s] *Id eſt, abſtulit eum Deus per mortem.*
[t] *Ecce, ego aufero à te deſiderium oculorum tuorum.*
[u] *Mortuus eſt Rabbi Emmi, quia rapuit eum mors.*

Quis Deus, Octavi, te nobis abſtulit?——
——& te
Raptum, & Romanam flebimus hiſtoriam.
What God, Octavius, Took the away from us?
We will bemoan the death of thee, And of our Romane hiſtorie.

So farre Druſius in the preface to his book called *Henoch*. But this is no good expoſition, ſince God took away by death all the reſt of the Patriarchs, as well as Enoch; and yet it is moſt ſingularly ſpoken of Enoch, *He was not found, for God took him. By death*, ſaith the ſhallow Jew: but our divine Apoſtle ſaith, *He was tranſlated, that he might not ſee death.* What Chriſtian or rationall man will doubt, but we are to incline to the Apoſtle?

Again, the third anſwer brought by Druſius (againſt his own opinion, as himſelf profeſſeth) to prove, that *VIDERE MORTEM*, *To ſee death*, doth not ſignifie to die a naturall death, where there is a true ſeparation of the ſoul from the bodie: and that, *NON VIDERE MORTEM*, *Not to ſee death*, on the contrary, doth not ſignifie To be kept alive from death, (which I, with Druſius, do ſay, was the true intent of the Apoſtle) draweth to this head, *Enoch ſaw not death, that is, died not; becauſe the holy Scriptures, where they make mention of his rapture, mention not his death.* I anſwer, If all were true, yet it followeth not, that Enoch is dead, or ſhall die; which is the point queſtioned.

Moreover, if Enoch were dead, or to die; the wiſdome of the Divine Inſpirer, would never have ſingled out ſuch a phraſe, among ſo many other thouſand, as ſhould leade men to think the clean contrary. *He was tranſlated, that he ſhould not ſee death.* For there reſteth the period. If it had been meant, he ſhould die; it would have been added, *He ſhould not ſee death, for a long time*; or, *He ſhould not ſee death, till toward the end of the world*; or the like. But, *He was tranſlated, that he ſhould not ſee death*; Therefore he ſhall never ſee death.

Suarez, *in tertiam partem ſummæ, quæſt. 59. artic. 6. ſect. 1.* ſaith directly, *S. Paul meaned, that Enoch ſhould not die in that place, into which he was tranſlated.* True; But why ſhould he die in any other place? or indeed why ſhould he die at all, who, above other men, was rapted purpoſely, *That he might not ſee death?* Surely, the deferring of death, for a time, is not ſo great a favour; The exempting one wholly from death, is a bleſſing, above ordinary. Again, it is ſaid of Enoch, Geneſ. 5. 23. *All his dayes were 365.* (where *dayes* are taken for *yeares*, as otherwhere in Scripture:) But theſe are not all his dayes, if either he remove from one place of the earth into an other, (which Salianus fondly imagined) or live now in a mortall corruptible bodie.

It is ſaid of our bleſſed Saviour, Hebr. 5. 7. He poured out prayers *in the dayes of his fleſh*; that is, whileſt he lived on earth the life of nature, in an elementary, terrene, humane, paſſive bodie. And of ſome other Patriarchs, *All the dayes of* them were ſuch, and ſuch, Geneſ. 5. 17, 20, &c. that is, all the dayes while they breathed on the earth the breath of life in mortall bodies. Therefore even from the very phraſe concerning Enoch, *All his dayes were 365.* we may inferre, He lived not in a mortall bodie any longer on the earth, He liveth not now any where in a mortall bodie.

Somewhat muſt I ſay alſo of Elias ſeverally. Rabbi Solomon, on the 5 of Geneſ. ſaith, *When Elijah was hurried up in a fiery chariot, his bodie was burnt up of that fire*: and, *Other Jews*

agree

agree with him, ſaith [x] Bellarmine. For my part, I ſay, I will not embrace an unlikelihood, though it runne toward my opinion. I think, the cloke might have been burnt, as well as his bodie; and Eliſhah could not have eſcaped ſcorching, when the fire parted them. Again, the aſhes might have fallen, as well as his mantle. And the Jew would account it no great favour, to be burnt alive. That fire, certainly, was rather *conſervative*, then *deſtructive*: not *penal*, and *conſuming*, as the fire from heaven drawn down by Elias, 2. Kings, 1. 12. not *punitive*, and *conſerving*, as the fire of hell, *Everlaſting*, Matth. 25. 41. *Unquenchable*, Mark 9. 43. but like the fierie furnace, in which the three children ſang, Daniel 3. 25. or the fire in the buſh, Exod. 3. 3. harmleſſe, yea gracious: or the fire at the conſummation of the world, which one calleth *Ignem rationalem*. The phraſe then, 2. Kings 2. 11. importeth no leſſe: *Elijah went up, by a whirlwinde into heaven*; Elijah, All Elijah, Whole Elijah, Soul and bodie. His ſoul had no need of a whirlwinde; *Elijah went up*. It is varied, 1. Maccab. 2. 58. *He was taken up into heaven*. His rapture excluded not his willingnes: his willingnes had been inſufficient without his rapture: his *aſcenſion* being grounded on *aſſumption*: the power being *Gods*, not *his*: or, his *paſſively*, and Gods *actively*.

[x] *De Romano Pontifice* 3 6.

If it be true what Bellarmine avoucheth, *That ſome other Jews agree with Rabbi Solomon in this, that Elijah was burned*; Yet I am ſure, [y] Sixtus Senenſis citeth the opinion of other Jews, to the contrarie. For they ſaid, that the length of time, from the beginning of man till the end of the world, hath been, and ſhall be meaſured by the ſeverall lives of ſeven men: and, that there was never houre from mans creation to the generall reſurrection, but ſome one of theſe ſeven men did or ſhall live in it. Adam lived to ſee Methuſelah; Methuſelah was alive in Sems time: Sem died not till Jacob was born: Jacob lived till Amram Moſes his father was born: Amram expired not till Ahijah the Shilonite lived: Ahijah lived with Elijah: Elijah ſhall live till the end of the world: Therefore they thought Elijah was not burnt, is not dead. But firſt, the Papiſts themſelves ſay, that Elijah ſhall be ſlain by Antichriſt, before the end of world: Therefore this maketh not for them. Secondly, the Jews might have tucked up the time ſhorter, on this faſhion: Adam lived in the dayes of Enoch; and Enoch to the end of the world. And ſo their number of ſeven might be reduced unto two. But let us leave theſe Rabbinicall ſpeculations concerning Elijah; and ſay ſomewhat of him, not as he was in a Paradiſe of phanſie, but as he was with our bleſſed Saviour on the mount, at that glorious transfiguration. And this I ſet down for certain; No paſſage in the Goſpels proveth demonſtratively, that his bodie was immortall. It is true,

[y] *Bibliotheca Sancta lib. 2. pag. 65.*

it is ſaid of Elijah and of Moſes, Οἱ ὀφθέντες ἐν δόξῃ, *they appeared in glory*: which apparition I hold to be *true*, and *reall*; though *temporarie*. They were [z] *ſeen in glorie*, ſaith Montanus. I adde, that the glorie of their ſouls could not be ſeen by the bodily eyes of the Apoſtles; and that the Apoſtles could not know them by their ſouls, but by their bodies. And, queſtionleſſe, the bodily glory was meant, and aimed at. Yet none of this can extort a neceſſarie argument, that the bodies of Moſes, or Elijah, were immortall, or impaſſible.

[z] *Viſi in gloria.*

Firſt, concerning Moſes, Del Rio, *Magicarum Diſquiſitionum* 2. *Quæſt.* 26. *Sect.* 2. ſaith, *It is not improbable, but that Moſes appeared in an aeriall bodie.* Indeed Tertullian cometh ſomewhat neare to Del Rio (though the Jeſuite cite him not) [a] *Moſes appeared in the ſimilitude of fleſh which he had not received: for the denomination is taken from the better part.* But, *He is called Moſes from his ſoul, which being the better part, and preſent, gives the denomination*, ſaith Del Rio. True, ſay I, where both matter and form are joyned in one: where there is a *COMPOSITUM*, *An unitie framed of a dualitie*, A τὰ ἄμφω. *All the ſouls which came into Egypt, &c.* Geneſ. 46. 27. is ſpoken of ſuch, as then conſiſted both of ſouls and bodies.

[a] *Moſes apparuit in imagine carnis nondum receptæ: nam à parte potiore facienda eſt denominatio.*

Secondly, I confeſſe, Abraham, Dives, and Lazarus are ſo called, though their bodies were ſeparated then from them. Yet let Del Rio give me a Scripture-inſtance, where ever any one man or humane ſoul in an aeriall bodie, is called that partie whoſe ſoul it is. The triviall objection of Samuel I purpoſely balk (becauſe I am ſo farre flown out alreadie) ſtanding upon this, that either true Samuel appeared not; or, if he did, he appeared in his own bodie.

The queſtion which Alexander asked of the firſt man of the Gymnoſophiſts, was, Whether the dead or the living made the greater number? He anſwered, The living: For the dead (ſaid he) are no more men. The reaſon of his anſwer, is grounded on theſe Aphoriſmes; That the ſoul is not man: That the bodie is not man: That both ſoul and bodie do concurre to make a man. Neither doth Chriſts divine reaſon contradict any part of this, when he avoucheth, That God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. For Chriſt ſpake of the ſouls onely, or of ſouls which ſhould have bodies at the reſurrection; and the Gymnoſophiſt, of men conſiſting of ſouls and bodies, who are properly to be termed living men: whereas ſeparated ſouls, though living, are not truly living men.

Auguſtine, *de Civit. Dei*, 19. 3. hath it thus, out of the great Marcus Varro: *In the nature of man are two things; ſoul, and bodie: That the ſoul is farre better and more excellent then the bodie, he doubteth not: but whether the ſoul onely be the man, ſo that the bodie is but as the horſe is to the rider, he enquireth. For the horſe-*

horſeman is not the man and the horſe, but the man onely: yet he is called an horſeman, in reference to the riding of his horſe. Ludovicus Vives cometh in like a buſie bodie; and he, from Gellius, Marcellus, and Servius; and they, from Ennius and Virgil, will maintain that an *horſeman* is taken for an *horſe*; and an *horſe*, called an *horſeman*. I anſwer, Virgil followed Ennius his antique phraſe, and both of them Poeticall licence. But Varro uſed proper Philoſophicall terms; whileſt their language is improper, and in it ſelf both abſurd and untrue. S. Auguſtine out of Varro ſtill proceedeth; *Or whether the bodie onely be the man; being ſemblable to the ſoul, as the cup is to the potion: For the cup, and the potion contained in the cup, are not together called the cup: but the cup onely is called a cup, becauſe it is fit to hold the potion.* Vives here again cometh in with his over-nice exception, and criticiſm: [b] *That which men drink* (ſaith he) *is termed a cup, eſpecially by the Poets:*

Poculáque inventis Acheloia miſcuit uvis:

his meaning being, that *he did mingle wine in the cups of Acheloius his framing.* I anſwer, that the *cups* in that place, are exactly diſtinguiſhed from the *wine* in them, and are not taken (*quatenus pocula*) for the liquor in them. Secondly, if any one hath at any time ſo uſed the word; it is Metaphorically, and not in proprietie of language. For he could not mingle wine *with*, but *in* the cups: nor did he properly mingle the cups with the wine.

[b] *Eſt etiam poculum id quod potatur, præſertim apud poetas.*

I paſſe from the ſecond interruption of Vives, to S. Auguſtine, out of Varro ſtill; *Or whether neither ſoul alone, nor bodie alone, but both togeher, be man: of which man one part is either the ſoul or the bodie; but he wholly conſiſteth of both, to be a man: as we call two horſes joyned together BIGAS; whereof either is part of the pair or couple; but neither is the pair or couple, but both harneſſed together.* In the end, *Varro reſolveth*, ſaith S. Auguſtine, *That neither the ſoul, nor the bodie, but both ſoul and bodie together is the man. And ſo the chief bleſſedneſſe of man conſiſteth in the good both of ſoul and bodie.* Which opinion is a divine truth; and S. Auguſtine approveth it, as may be gathered by his whole diſcourſe, and by the beginning of the fifth chap. of that book. So it was not the true Moſes, unleſſe the very ſoul and the very bodie of Moſes were preſent.

Yet Aquinas, 3. *part. quæſt.* 45. thinketh that Moſes appeared not in his own bodie: which Suarez confuteth by theſe authorities; S. Hierom, on Matth. 17. S. Auguſtine, *de Mirab. ſacræ Scripturæ*, 3. 10. which is followed by Sotus, *in* 4. *ſenten. diſtinct.* 43. Hieronymus Natalis the Jeſuit, thinks he ſtrikes all ſure: for amongſt his curious coſtly pictures upon the foure Goſpels, he picturing out the transfiguration of our Saviour, bringeth in Moſes with horns on his head; to deſigne, that it

was

was the ſame Moſes, and the ſame bodie which Moſes had on the mount; according to the Vulgat, Exod. 34. 29. *Ignorabat Moſes quòd cornuta eſſet facies ſua:* that is, according to Natalis his opinion, *Moſes knew not that he had horns:* and verſ.30. *Viderunt filii Iſrael cornutam faciem Moſis:* that is, according to the ſame mans phanſie, *The Iſraelites ſaw Moſes his horns:* though intruth the words may be farre better tranſlated. And ſo verſ.35. Was not the Jeſuits face made of horn, or rather of braſſe, who publiſhed in ſo ſeeing and cleare-ſighted an age, ſuch an ignorant conceit, with ſuch boldneſſe; when indeed the words in the Originall, as they are tranſlated by their own interlinearie, are onely thus, *Promicuiſſet cutis facierum ejus, The skin of his face was ſleek:* and in the margin is, *Reſplendebat, did ſhine:* which is alſo uſed in the Tranſlation of Vatablus? Likewiſe, in the two other before-recited places, the ſame phraſe is uſed. The Septuagint have it, Καὶ Μωϋσῆς ἐκ ᾔδει ὅτι δεδόξασται ἡ ὄψις τῆς χρωτὸς τῆς προσώπου αὐτοῦ· [c] *Moſes knew not that the ſplendour of his face and countenance was glorified,* as Vatablus tranſlateth the Seventy; Which, he ſaith, more fully expreſſeth the Hebrew, and is accordingly followed by the Apoſtle, 2. Cor. 3. 7. *for the glorie of his countenance.* Indeed the Original קָרַן, doth properly ſignifie an horn: from whence קָרַן, is *ſplendere, radiare, fulgere, to ſhine. Becauſe* (ſaith Vatablus from a learned Jew, *when man beholdeth earneſtly, and intentively, the Sunne, or any luminous bodie; the rayes ſeem to be ſent forth of it, like horns, in ſome ſort. But* (ſaith Vatablus) *out of the falſe, or ill-underſtood verſion of the Vulgat, they, who were no linguiſts, made the people falſly beleeve, that Moſes had two horns on his head; which is moſt falſe.* So farre Vatablus, though a man of their own, againſt the brainſick faction of the Jeſuit; who will maintain the people in any errour, if it be old; rather then ſuffer reformation. The Caldee hath it, *Multiplicatus eſt ſplendor gloriæ vultûs Moſis, The brightneſſe of Moſes his face increaſed in glory more and more:* Cornelius à Lapide the Jeſuit, though he ſtrive for the truth of the Vulgat, yet ſaith, *Moſes had no horns in his forehead;* [d] *as painters place on him.* Little perhaps did he think, that his fellow-Jeſuit Hieronymus Natalis was one of theſe painters; yea and that in one of the coſtlyeſt editions of the ſtorie of the Goſpels, that ever was ſet forth. But the wiſer and more ſuccinct Sa, hath it, *HORNY,* [e] *that is, gliſtering: in the Hebrew, reſplendent.* And Cajetan, better then he, [f] *In the litterall ſignification we have nothing to do with horn, though perchance there is ſome alluſion to it by a Metaphor.*

Concerning which Moſes his face, I will end with two obſervations.

The firſt is a very idle one, out of Bellarmine, *De Sanctorum reliquiis* 2. 4. [g] *It is very credible, that the dead bodie of Moſes preſer-*

[c] *Ignorabat Moſes quòd glorificatus eſſet aſpectus faciei ejus.*

[d] *Vtì affingunt ei pictores.*

[e] Cornuta, *id eſt, radios emittens; Hebraicè, radians.*

[f] *Nihil cornutum, ad literam, ſignificatur &c.*

[g] *Valde credibile eſt, Moſis corpus, licèt mortuum, conſervâſſe adhuc ſplendorem vultûs, & decorem quem antea habebat; ſicut multis Sanctorum accidit.*

preſerved the radiant comelineſſe and beauty of his face, which he had in life: as it hath happened to many of the Saints. But he nameth no Saint: And if he did, we ſhould hardly beleeve him. And Moſes himſelf died privately: and was buried ſecretly: no man ſaw him dying or dead. I acknowledge that ſome of the Ancients have inclined to this, *viz*, that Moſes his face did ſhine all his life time, when he ſpake to the people. So Ambroſe, *in Pſal.* 118. [h] *So long as Moſes lived, and ſpake to the people, he had a vail before his face:* not after death, as Bellarmine thinks probable. Beſides, the Apoſtle, 2. Corinth. 3. 7. termeth it δόξαν καταργουμένην, *the glorie of his countenance, which was to be done away:* Therefore it continued not after death; if it did till then, whenſoever he ſpake to the people. And our late tranſlation ſeemeth in part to accord, Exod. 34. 33. *Till Moſes had done ſpeaking with them, he put a vail on his face:* Yet the word *Till*, is not in the originall: but it may be probably expounded, That when Moſes had done ſpeaking, he put a vail on his face (for ſo the Hebrew, Greek, and Latine runne:) And though Moſes ordinarily put off the vail, when he went to ſpeak with God; and put it on, when he returned: yet once, and at the firſt of all, he might ſpeak unto the people with face open, for more reverence and majeſtie.

[h] *Quamdiu vixit Moſes, & alloquebatur populum, velamen habuit in facie.*

The ſecond obſervation is from Origen, *Homil.* 12. *in Exod. circa medium*; and it is a good one. *In the Law* (ſaith he) *Moſes his face was glorified, though vailed: but his hand put into his boſome WAS LEAPROUS AS SNOW, Exod.* 4. 6. [i] *In his ſhining countenance was a figure of the Law: by his hands are works ſignified. Now becauſe no man can be juſtified by the works of the Law, his hand was leprous.* — *His face was glorified, but vailed: therefore his words were full of knowledge; yet ſecret, and hidden.* — *Yea, in the Law, Moſes had onely a glorified face: hands and feet were unglorified:* — *for Moſes alſo put off his ſhoes, that an other, in after times, might have the bride:* [k] *and ſhe be called to this day the houſe of the unſhod.* — [l] *But in the Goſpels all Moſes is wholly glorified.* — *It ſeemeth alſo to mee, that Moſes rejoiceth in this point: becauſe himſelf in a ſort, now layeth aſide his vail: being converted to Chriſt, when thoſe things are plainly fulfilled, which he foretold.*

[i] *In vultu ejus ſermo legis; in manu opera deſignantur.*

[k] *Et illa vocaretur domus diſcalceati uſque in hodiernum diem.*

[l] *In Evangeliis autem Moſes totus glorificatur ex integro. Gaudere etiam mihi pro hoc videtur Moſes, quia & ipſe quodammodo nunc deponit velamen, converſus ad Dominum, cùm evidenter, quæ prædixit, implentur.*

By which glorification you cannot neceſſarily interpret ſuch a glorification as the Saints ſhall have after judgement, which never ſhall have end, where [m] *corruptible ſhall put on incorruption* immutable: but onely of a temporarie glorification: for Moſes layd down his bodie again, as is held moſt probably.

[m] 1. Cor. 15. 53.

The authour of that book, which is intituled *Altercatio Synagogæ & Eccleſiæ, cap.* 21. (S. Paul and Gamaliel being interlocutours) thus; *Jeſus Chriſt after his transfiguration* [n] *buried Moſes.* A ſtrange honour, (if true) that the ſame, who was buried

[n] *Moſis corpus ſepulturæ commendavit.*

ried by God himſelf in the Old Teſtament, ſhould be thus glorified for a while, and after buried by Chriſt himſelf in the New Teſtament.

Furthermore, that there is no abſolute neceſſitie, that either Moſes or Elias (though they were ſeen in glorie) had immortall and impaſſible bodies by the transfiguration, appeareth by this, That our bleſſed Saviour himſelf, after that his transfiguration, had a mortall bodie, and did die: eſpecially, if we conſider, that his glorie was greater then theirs; as the *Maſters* is above the *Servants*; and the *Lords*, above the *Attendants*.

Barradas on the transfiguration, ſaith, [o] *Chriſt would have his ſervants preſent, transfigured as well as himſelf, and adorned with ſingular glorie and majeſtie: as at marriages and other feſtivall dayes, the nobilitie richly clad do wait on Kings.* Tertullian, *adverſus Marcionem, cap.* 22. ſaith, *Moſes and Elias were ſeen* [p] *equally bright and glorious.* Luke 9.29. Ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ προσεύχεσθαι αὐτὸν τὸ εἶδος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἕτερον; *As he prayed, the faſhion of his countenance was altered.* [q] *Let no man imagine* (ſaith Hierom) *that our Saviour loſt the nature of a true bodie; onely he converted the outward form and faſhion all into brightnes.* The like may I ſay of Moſes and Elias; if they had their glorie by redundance from Chriſts glorie, as Suarez maintaineth: and then there is no neceſſitie, nor indeed great likelihood, that Chriſts glorious transfiguration ſhould leave to himſelf a mortall bodie; and they ſhould be by him then inveſted in eternall tabernacles of incorruptible fleſh.

Now as I have clearely declared my judgement, that it holdeth not demonſtratively from any *puncto*, that Elias at the transfiguration had an unchangeably glorious eſtate of bodie: ſo I hold it very probable, that Elias did never die properly; but was changed at his rapture; and, at his ingreſſe into heaven, enjoyed a truly glorified bodie; and both unto the time of Chriſts transfiguration, and then, and ever ſince enjoyeth, and liveth in fleſh incorruptible; not *Animall*, but *Spirituall*, as the bleſſed Saints ſhall have after the end of the world.

If any one think to choke me with my former words, That Chriſts glorie was greater then the glorie of his ſervants; And therefore, if Elias had an immortall bodie, Chriſt muſt have one alſo; which he had not: I anſwer, That the hypoſtaticall union of the Divine Nature to the Humane in Chriſt, was at all times of greater glorie, then the glorified eſtate of the Saints ſhall be after the reſurrection.

Secondly, as *intenſively* Chriſts glorie was greater then Elijahs, though it was eclipſed by Chriſts voluntarie condeſcent, that he might accompliſh the work of our redemption: ſo *extenſively*, at the inſtant of the transfiguration, I doubt not, but the bodily glorie of Chriſt was as farre above his ſervants glorie, as the light of the ſunne ſurpaſſeth the light of leſſer ſtarres.

[o] *Transfigurationi ſuæ transfiguratos, gloriâque ac ſingulari majeſtate ornatos, voluit Chriſtus adeſſe ſervos ſuos: ſic ſolent in nuptiis feſtiſq; aliis diebus nobiles viri, pretioſis ornati veſtibus, Regibus adeſſe.*

[p] *In conſortio claritatis.*

[q] *Nemo putet, Salvatorem veritatem corporis amiſiſſe; externam tantùm ſpeciem permutavit ſplendore.*

ſtarres. Therefore, all things conſidered, Chriſts bodily glorie was greater then Elijahs, though Elijahs was *immortall*, and Chriſts then *changeable* and *mortall*.

Bellarmine, in his Apologie againſt the judicious Monitorie preface of King James, eſteemeth it as [p] *much to be admired at*, that the learned King ſaid, *Enoch and Elias are now glorified in heaven*. Many things indeed might Bellarmine learn by his Majeſtie, which are *& laudanda, & valde admiranda, both to be praiſed and wondred at:* but, taking *valde admirandum* in the worſer ſenſe, I ſay, his wonder is full of ignorance and malice. Wherefore, omitting much of what that really-unanſwerable Biſhop hath copiouſly alledged, I ſay, It is no ſuch ſtrange matter, to ſay, or beleeve, that Enoch and Elias have glorified bodies. And yet here, firſt of all, I will ingenuouſly confeſſe that a man, both in ſoul and in a corruptible bodie, may be in the third heaven: becauſe S. Paul elſe might have known, that himſelf was not in the third heaven in his bodie: but his doubting and neſciencie (2. Cor. 12. 2, &c. *Whether in the bodie, I cannot tell; or whether out of the bodie, I cannot tell; God knoweth*) proveth that either might have been. The disjunctive might elſe have been ſpared, if it could have been done onely one way: Therefore it is poſſible unto the Almightie, that Elias might or may have a paſſive mortall bodie, though he were rapt into heaven, and there be at this preſent. But, *A poſſe ad eſſe non valet conſequentia:* and the reaſons and authoritie which place Elias in heaven, in an unpaſſible bodie, are more ponderous and numerous, then theirs which embrace the contrarie.

[p] *Valde admirandum.*

If it be objected, that Elias went not up into the third heaven, becauſe he was carried up in a whirlwinde: and whirlwindes reach not to the third heaven: I anſwer, By the ſame cavill they may ſay, Our Saviour aſcended not into heaven, when *a cloud received him out of their ſight*, Act. 1. 9. becauſe clouds pierce not to the higheſt heaven. But we muſt diſtinguiſh between things *ordinarie* and *extraordinarie*. Both the whirlwinde and the cloud had ſomewhat in them above the common leuell of nature, and were not meerly elementarie; but adapted to higher and diviner uſes, then common clouds or whirlwindes.

I remove this paſſant tabernacle of diſcourſe from an objection unto the ſtanding manſion of our great Adverſaries confeſſions. Suarez, *in tertiam partem Summ. quæſt. 53. artic. 3.* confeſſeth in this manner: [q] *Some men are in hell both ſoul and bodie, before the generall reſurrection: as Dathan, and Abiram, and the like.* He is ſeconded by Peter Morales, another Jeſuit, in his fifth book on the firſt chapter of S. Matthew, Tract. 11. This opinion is ſomewhat minced by Ribera, upon the words,

[q] *Sunt in inferno aliqui homines, corpore & animâ, ante generalem reſurrectionem; ut Dathan, Abiram, & ſimiles.*

Revel. 19.20. *Theſe both were caſt alive into a lake of fire burning with brimſtone:* who hath his ſecond alſo, *viz.* Blaſius Viegas; for they ſay, *Korah, Dathan, and Abiram were ſwallowed up alive; but then the earth cloſed, and they died, and their ſouls onely were carried into hell.* The like they ſay of Antichriſt, and his fore-runner. But this nicetie is contradicted by the Vulgat, which to them is authenticall: Num. 16.33. *Deſcenderunt vivi in infernum:* ſo alſo in the thirtieth verſe; and ſo the Interlinearie rightly readeth it, according to the Hebrew. And if *infernus* did ſignifie the *grave*, in the caſe of Korah and his complices, as it doth not (for then it had been no ſuch extraordinarie miracle, for people alive to be ſwallowed up by the earths rupture; ſince many people, yea, whole cities have often been ſo puniſhed, and came to deſtruction: but *they were for a ſigne*, Numb. 26.10. that is, *for an example*; that others ſhould not murmure and rebell againſt Gods Miniſters; as the Genevean Note on the place, ſoundly, and pertinently, and deeply interpreteth:) yet concerning Antichriſt and his falſe-prophet, mentioned by them, it cannot be ſo: for it is ſaid moſt punctually, Revel. 19. 20. Ζῶντες ἐβλήθησαν οἱ δύο εἰς τὴν λίμνην τοῦ πυρὸς τὴν καιομένην ἐν θείῳ· *Vivi miſſi ſunt hi duo in ſtagnum ignis ardentis, & ſulphuris, Theſe both were caſt alive into a lake of burning fire and brimſtone*, as it is in their Vulgat. Montanus varieth it thus, *In ſtagnum ardens in ſulphure, Into a lake burning in brimſtone.* They did not deſcend [r] *to the grave, to hell, to the lake of fire, excluſively*; coming onely to the brink: but, [ſ] *they deſcended into hell, into the lake of fire*, they were plunged into it. Therefore they did not die by the way, or at the gates of hell; but actually and really entred into thoſe horrible manſions, or burning chambers. For both Ribera and Viegas will be aſhamed to ſay, that the grave burneth with fire and brimſtone; which they muſt be forced to ſay, if they continue to hold, that Antichriſt and his fore-runner leave their bodies in the grave.

Andreas Cæſarienſis (ſaith Viegas on Revel. 13.) *thinketh that Antichriſt and his fore-runner ſhall not die;* [t] *but with incorruptible bodies ſhall deſcend alive into hell.* And as concerning Korah, and his fellow-mutiners; though ſome think, it cannot be underſtood literally, of the nethermoſt hell; becauſe it is ſaid, Numb. 16. 33. *They, and all that appertained to them, went down alive into the pit:* but their goods, and their houſes went not to hell: therefore not their bodies: Yet I anſwer, The Text is too much wrung, and ſtrained: for by the like wrench, they may as well prove that their houſes and goods were alive: the letter will bear one as well as the other, if they ground on ſome tranſlation of the Seventie; for of the Originall I ſhall ſpeak anon. But the true meaning is, They, and

r *Ad ſepulchrum, ad infernum, ad ſtagnum ignis excluſivé.*
ſ *Deſcenderunt in infernum, in ſtagnū ignis.*
t *Sed incorrupto corpore, vivos ad infernum deſcenſuros.*

and all their things, came to that destruction, which in their nature they were capable of: their tents and goods were swallowed up and consumed; their bodies were hurried to their own places; not of rest (as is the common death of all men, till the judgement generall) but extraordinarily, they endured present punishment.

Our learned Doctour Raynolds, *Tom.* 1. *de libris Apocryphis, prælect.* 81. *pag.* 973. relateth, that Epiphanius, *in Ancorato*, held; Korah, Dathan, and their rebellious troups, [a] *descended living and quick into hell; their souls not disunited from their bodies; no remnant or part left behinde: but they all and wholly, souls and bodies, were delivered up to torment.* And thus that most learned Professour discourseth, [z] *They descended, with all things that were theirs, alive into hell, as it is in the Hebrew. What is meant by those words, All things? Their Tabernacles, houses, and goods. But I beleeve, the Papists will not say, that their houses and goods descended into the place of souls; but into the place of bodies. Therefore Moses denoteth the place of bodies, not of souls.* The honoured Doctour might also have considered, that it may be as well said, that their *bodies* went to *hell*, as their *souls* to the *sepulchre*; if the place of their descent had been understood onely of the receptacles of *bodies*, and not of *souls*. Secondly, (as I touched before) may not as well their bodies go to hell alive, as *they*, *and all that appertained to them, went down* (as the Seventie in Vatablus have it) *alive into the pit?* Thirdly, did their tabernacles, houses, beasts, and goods go down into their graves? Graves are not the proper places for tents, beasts and goods; but for humane bodies. Those terms of *locus corporum*, are obscure; and culled out purposely, for a starting-hole: whereas, if he had said, Moses denoted their sepulchres onely, and not hell (which he doth in effect afterward;) we may presse him with this, That they are much happier then other: for whereas others bring nothing into this world, nor carrie any thing out of it; these men went not to hell, in Moses his meaning; but carried with them, out of this world, their beasts, their goods, yea their very tents. But their *miserie* and *curse extraordinarie* is described, and not their *happinesse*.

Lastly, I could wish that the worthy Doctour had throughly weighed how divinely the Holy Writ discriminateth severall matters. Moses propheſied Numb. 16. 30. *If the earth swallow them up, with all that appertain unto them, and they go down quick into the pit, &c.* where you must interpret it, as if he had thus said, *The earth indeed shall swallow and cover alike both them and all their goods: but the persons themselves shall go down alive* (*VIVENTES, living*, as the Interlinearie hath it; *vivi*, as Doctour Raynolds) *lower; even to the pit.* And accordingly it came to passe, vers. 32. *The earth swallowed them up, and their houses, and*

[a] *Descendisse viventes in orcum, non corporibus solutis, neque reliquiis traditis, aut parte; sed totis ipsis, cum corpore & anima, traditis in supplicium.*

[z] *Descenderunt ipsi, cum omnibus quæ ipsorum erant, vivi in infernum; quomodo habetur in Hebraico contextu. Quæ sunt illa omnia? Tabernacula, & domus, & opes ipsorum. Atqui non dicent (credo) Pontificii, domos earum & facultates omnes in locum animarum descendisse, sed in locum corporum.*

all the men that appertained unto Korah, and all their goods: where you ſee, the earth ſwallowed all alike; the chief leaders, and their goods; the aſſociates of Korah, and all their goods. Yet for the perſons themſelves, it is ſaid in the next verſe, by way of diſtinction, remarkably; *They, and all that appertained to them, went down alive into the pit:* which you cannot poſſibly interpret of their goods, and tabernacles: (for they never were alive; and never could go down alive, no not to the grave, or to any pit whatſoever) but of the principals, and the acceſſaries; *viz.* the chief rebels, and their partakers: for diverſe *men* appertained to them, as is apparent verſ. 32. and therefore, what our Engliſh tranſlation hath ſomewhat dubiouſly, and ambiguouſly, *They, and all that appertained to them,* (where it is not ſignificantly enough expreſſed, whether men onely, or men and goods are compriſed under the words) the Interlinearie hath exactly, and truly determined, [y] *They deſcended, and all the men which lived with them, alive into hell:* and Vatablus, [z] *And both they deſcended and as many men as were their partakers, living and quick into hell:* the *quot quot* having reference to men onely, not to other things: for then it would have been *viventia*, and not *viventes:* and therefore in the margin of Vatablus, it is thus varied, [a] *All they who belonged to them.* Where the maſculine gender deſigneth out the men onely to go alive into the pit. To be plain, I care for no opinion, as it is an opinion of Bellarmines, or of the Pontificians; but if they light upon a truth, I will accept of it, not as *theirs*, but as *true:* [b] *Socrates ſhall be my companion, Plato my friend, truth my familiar friend:* and *Vel veritas, vel*

——— *Virtus & in hoſte probatur.*

Or truth, or any vertue do I like,
Even in an enemie that would me ſtrike.

And I hold Bellarmines opinion true, That Korah, his partiſans and companie, deſcended alive into hell. And that שְׁאוֹל in Numbers 16.30, and 33 verſes, ſignifieth hell properly. [c] *You ſhall diſcern by the manifeſt circumſtances of the place, that Moſes meaneth ſome place under the earth fitted or appointed as receptacles of bodies, not of ſouls,* ſaith Doctour Raynolds.

Herein I muſt needs diſſent. And firſt, I ſay, What is this [a] *place of bodies?* It muſt be either the grave, or hell; or let him deſigne us out a third place. A third place he cannot name; eſpecially for humane bodies. Some held concerning infants, *That in regard of their innocencie they are to have eternall life: but becauſe they were not baptized, they ſhould not be with Chriſt in his kingdome.* But Auguſtine ſaith, That Chriſt himſelf confuted [b] *this new-invented middle or third manſion:* and as he ſaid a little before, more generally, [c] *It is impoſſible for any man to be in any middle place, but he muſt needs be with the devil, who is not with Chriſt:* ſo do I ſay of this *Locus*

[y] *Deſcenderunt ipſi, & omnes, qui eis, viventes in inferuum.*
[z] *Deſcenderúntque ipſi, & quotquot ad eos pertinebant, viventes in inferuum.*
[a] *Omnes, qui eis.*
[b] *Amicus Socrates, amicus Plato; ſed magis amica Veritas.*
[c] *Ex manifeſtis loci circumſtantiis intelligetis, notari à Moſe locum ſubterraneum,* corporum, *non* animarum.
[a] *Locus corporum.*
[b] *—iſtam (neſcio quam) medietatem.* De peccator. Merit. & Remiſ. I. 28.
[c] *Nec eſt ullus alli medius locus, ut poſſit eſſe, niſi cum diabolo, qui non eſt cum Chriſto.*

cus corporum, It is either hell, or the grave: *Tertium locum penitus ignoramus*, *We know no third place.* The Papists erre, to establish a Purgatorie for the soul, besides hell and heaven: And Doctour Raynolds doth not well, to mention so often a *Locus corporum*; where he ought to name, Where it is, and What bodies go into it.

Secondly, it is plain, that their souls did sinne, their souls were punished, and went down to hell. Doth not the Apostle S. Jude (vers. 11.) speak of such, as *perished in the gainsaying of Korah*; — *to whom*, not the wo of a sudden death is denounced, but (vers. 13.) *the blacknesse of darknesse for ever is reserved?* doth not the place stand fair for the damnation of Korah and his fellows? Though Doctour Raynolds minceth it in this doubtfull manner: [d] *I denie not but their souls, if they died obstinate in their wicked rebellion, were adjudged to the hell where Dives was.* Again, when the Scripture saith, *Si creationem creaverit Dominus*, (Numb. 16. 30.) *If the Lord shall make a new thing*, or *a strange thing*, as new almost, as strange to sight almost, as is the creation (for I take so much to be implyed in that unusuall phrase;) what reason hath that grave Doctour to say, [e] *That which is properly meant by the words, IF THEY GO DOWN QUICK INTO HELL, is nothing else, but that the horrible and dreadfull judgement of God, divinely shall be inflicted on them, viz. in such sort, that whereas others first die, and then are buried, these shall be buried (as it were) alive.* Why so reservedly and cautelously is it added, *As it were, alive?* Again, [f] *It was the place of bodies, and not of souls, into which Korah, Dathan, and Abiram descended:* (as if their souls were in the place appointed for bodies) which he further parallelleth with the burying alive of the deflowred Vestall virgins: though he ought to distinguish between the extraordinary miraculous hand of God, and the ordinary justice of men in such cases. And the Vestall virgins were farre longer ere they died, then Korah and his companie, ere they were swallowed up.

Let the judicious reader ponder these words of that famous Doctour, *Is nothing else:* and *Shall be buried, as it were, alive:* and, *Korah, Dathan, and Abiram descended not into the place of souls* (though the souls of all wicked men do so: and their souls, by his reason, should have more priviledge then other wicked mens:) and, I dare say, he will think that Doctour Raynolds might more safely have held the other opinion, That their souls and bodies went alive to hell properly so called.

That Moses denoteth the place of bodies, I denie not: for even that place is in hell, for all the bodies of the wicked in due time, and for these mens bodies, extraordinarily, before the generall judgement.

[d] *Non inficior, quin eorum animæ, si sint mortui pertinaces in scelerata sua obstinatione, adjudicatæ sint inferis, cum Divite.*

[e] *Illud quod propriè notatur in verbis*--*Descenderintq; viventes in infernum, nihil est aliud, quàm, horribile & tremendum judicium Dei divinitus illis inflictum iri: ut, cùm alii priùs moriantur quàm sepeliantur, ipsi quasi vivi sepeliantur.*

[f] *Locus fuit corporum, non animarum, in quem descenderunt Corah, Dathan, & Abiram.*

But I am loth to ſay, Moſes meant not the place of ſouls: I am loth to entertain a thought, That the Rebels themſelves did repent; for, if they did ſo, they are ſaved: I would be loth to flee from rationable probabilitie, to poſſibilitie; which hath a farre-ſtretched almightie arm; and to ſay, as he doth, [g] *It may be that ſome of them were not faultie; or, if they were, repented.* That they repented who were ſwallowed up alive, ſeems not agreeable to S. Jude, who (ver. 11.) pronounceth a fearfull wo againſt ſuch as are like unto them, and periſhed in the gainſaying of Korah: In which wo, not temporall bodily puniſhment alone, but eternall torment of the ſoul is included. Compare the words with 2. Pet. 2. 12. Moreover, none dares denie the poſſibilitie of repentance; but who can think it probable, That God would ſend ſuch an extraordinarie puniſhment on ſuch as were innocent, or repented; when as the children of that Luciferian Arch-rebel Korah, were exempted from that deſtruction? Numb. 26. 11. *Notwithſtanding the children of Korah died not:* yea, were eminent and famous among the Levites; *Were over the work of the ſervice, keepers of the gates of the Tabernacle, and their fathers were over the hoſte of the Lord: — and the Lord was with* them, 1. Chron. 9. 19. &c. And they were either excellent Muſicians, or Singers, or Pen-men for Divine Service; as may be collected from many Pſalmes, intituled, *To the ſonnes of Korah*; as, Pſal. 42. Pſal. 44. Pſal. 87. And when the Scripture ſaith, *They deſcended alive into the pit*, I would be loth to varie the phraſe as he doth, [h] *if they died in their obſtinacie.* I denie not, but in a large ſenſe, they may be ſaid *to die:* and the Scripture ſaith, They ſhould not *die the common death of all men*, Numb. 16. 29. yet alſo, *They deſcended alive into the pit:* which cannot be better reconciled, then to ſay, The ſtate of their bodies was changed; immortalitie ſwallowed up their mortalitie, in the act of their *deſcending*, or *paßion* rather, if you will ſo call it. There was no true ſeparation between their ſouls and their bodies; and therefore they died not: their *change* notwithſtanding may be reputed for a *death*; which perhaps alſo ſhall be the caſe of all the wicked, who ſhall be alive at Chriſts ſecond and glorious coming; and ſhall be certainly the eſtate of the righteous, who ſhall be alive at that great and dreadfull day.

I would be loth alſo to ſay, That nothing elſe is noted by the words, but that, Whereas others die firſt, and then are buried; theſe men were buried alive, or as live men: that I may paſſe by his amphibolous phraſe, [i] *I denie not, but their ſouls, if they died obſtinate in their wicked rebellion, were ſentenced to hell with Dives.* Why doth he not ſpecialize where thoſe *inferi* are? and in what place Dives is? or did they go to a para-

[g] *Fieri poteſt ut quidam eorum aut affines illi culpæ non fuerint; aut ſi fuerint, pœnitentiam egerint.*

[h] *Si ſint mortui pertinaces.*

[i] *Non inficior, quin eorum animæ, ſi ſint mortui pertinaces in ſceleratâ ſuâ obſtinatione, adjudicatæ ſint inferis cum Divite.*

parabolicall hell? for he could not be ignorant that many hold that hiſtorie of Dives to be but a parable.

The truth and ſumme of all is this; By divine power extraordinarie, the houſes, or tents, the beaſts, and the goods of Korah and his complices, were ſeparated and ſecluded from the uſe of men; were ſwallowed up, and covered in the earth, and came to that end and deſtruction which they were capable of: No word of God ſaith expreſſely, no inference or reaſon evinceth, no probabilitie induceth us to think, that their tents, houſhold-ſtuffe, or utenſils were alive; or that they, yea, or the beaſts of theſe conſpiratours, went into the graves of them, (if graves they had any;) much leſſe, did ſuch traſh deſcend into hell, that place of *torment*, that *Tophet* prepared for wicked men, that *Deep*, excruciating and affrighting both the Devil and his Angels. That tents, goods, and faculties ſhould go thither, to what purpoſe were it? but God doth nothing, unleſſe it be to ſome great end or purpoſe: therefore to the *loweſt hell* their goods deſcended not. But as concerning the men themſelves, it is plainly ſaid, That both the earth did open its mouth, and ſwallowed them up, (even as it did their tents, or beaſts, or goods:) and after that, moſt diſtinctly; that they went down alive into שְׁאוֹלָה: but their ſouls could not go into the *graves*, and there reſide; and their bodies might go into *hell*, and there reſide; therefore שְׁאוֹלָה, muſt needes there be expounded, not of the *grave*, nor of *locus corporum* (as Doctour Raynolds phraſeth it) but of the *hell of the damned*, of the *locus animarum*; which place alſo muſt be the receptacle for all humane bodies of the wicked, after the day of doom and retribution; and may be the priſon of thoſe reprobate both ſouls and bodies, whom God miraculouſly thither adjudgeth, as he did this rebellious rout.

Though Lyra, cited by Doctour Raynolds, thinks the grave is meant, becauſe *it is appointed for all men to die, and after that cometh judgement:* yet I have many wayes proved, that by eſpeciall diſpenſation, and by extraordinarie priviledge, ſome may receive favour, beyond the common rule or courſe of nature: and contrarily, I doubt not, but upon ſo great a commotion, and furious rebellion, God could, and did, by way of exemplarie puniſhment, puniſh theſe men bodily, before the uſuall time; and ſent their bodies to hell, before the generall judgement.

If Cajetan, and Hieronymus ab Oleaſtro, cited by that Reverend Doctour, expound שְׁאוֹלָה for the *grave*; yet they want both weight and age, to put down Epiphanius, before recited, and many other Ancients, who place their bodies in *hell*.

I accept then of Suarez his confeſſion before mentioned; and agree with him, That Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, are now,

both in ſouls and bodies, in hell. And upon this ground, I thus work: If they be there, they are there to be puniſhed, and are puniſhed: if they burn in hell-fire, they have no longer mortall bodies: But as at the laſt day, the bodies of the wicked, that are alive then, ſhall put on immortalitie; ſo the bodies of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, were not properly ſeparated from their ſouls; but were changed, and fitted for ſuch places of puniſhments, in the inſtant of their deſcent: and ſo they deſcended alive into the pit of hell.

Then why may not Enoch and Elias be in immortall and glorified bodies, ſince they were aſſumed up into heaven? eſpecially, ſince Suarez himſelf again ingenuouſly confeſſeth, [k] *It is convenient, yea proper to nature, that a glorified ſoul ſhould be united to an immortall and glorified bodie.* And the ſouls of Enoch and Elias are now glorified, by the like acknowledgement of our learned Adverſaries.

k *Animæ glorioſæ connaturale eſt uniri corpori immortali & glorioſo.*

Again, where the ſouls of Enoch and Elias are, there alſo are their bodies: But their ſouls are in the higheſt heaven. For our Saviour ſaith, John 17.24. *Father, I will that they alſo, whom thou haſt given me, be with me where I am.* And John 12.26. *Where I am, there ſhall alſo my ſervant be.* But Chriſt is in the higheſt heavens: Therefore both Enoch and Elias are, with their bodies, in the third heaven: unleſſe you can ſay, They were not given by God to Chriſt, and were not Chriſts ſervants. Now ſince they are there in their bodies; it is very unlikely, that they ſhould be there ſome thouſands of yeares in bodies mortall and unglorified. Hierom, *ad Pammachium*, avoucheth, [l] *They enjoy and have the fruition of the Deitie, and are fed with heavenly food:* which is not meat for mortall bodies.

l *Fruuntur divino conſortio, & cibo cæleſti.*

Beſides, S. Hierom, *Tom. 3. Epiſt. pag. 189. in Epiſtola ad Minerium & Alexandrum*, citeth Theodorus Heracleotes, inſtancing in Enoch and Elias, as carried to heaven, and as having overcome death. And Apollinarius fully agreeth with the other, with this addition onely, that Enoch and Elias have now glorified bodies. Dorotheus, *in Synopſi de Elia*, thus, [m] *Who was on the earth as other men; now, as a ſpirit, liveth in heaven with the Angels:* therefore he hath not a mortall bodie.

m *Qui humi incedebat; inſtar ſpiritus, cum Angelis in cœlis agit.*

Again, in moſt of the generall promiſes that God hath made, he giveth ſome inſtance or other, to be as it were a taſte of what ſhall ſucceed, leſt mens hearts ſhould fail, in expectancie of that, whereof they ſee no kinde of proof. As for example, becauſe it was promiſed, that there ſhall be a reſurrection, it was figured, not onely more obſcurely in Iſaac his riſing up from the Altar; in the drawing of Joſeph out of the pit; in the Whales deliverie of Jonah; in Samſons breaking from the cords; in Daniels eſcape from the lions; in the waters yeelding and giving up Moſes, to live in the Kings houſe, and

the

the like: but more evidently, by the reall, and temporarie raiſing up of divers dead, both in the Old and New Teſtament.

Likewiſe, the glorification of our bodies being determined by God, and by him promiſed; yea, Enoch himſelf propheſying, that *God cometh with ten thouſands of his Saints, to execute judgement upon all*, Jude 14, and 15 verſes; which is not, cannot be executed, without the glorifying of ſouls and bodies of his ſervants; we may well think, it pleaſed God to give to the old world a pledge or two of the generall glorification of the bodies of his Saints, by the particular performance of the ſame to the bodies of Enoch and Elias, whom he aſſumed up into heaven, by way of eſpeciall favour.

To this I may adde, That Enoch and Elijahs raptures being types of Chriſts aſcenſion, ſince Chriſt aſcended in a glorified and immortall bodie, the ſhadows muſt be like the ſubſtance: and therefore they aſcended in glorified immortall bodies.

Suarez is driven to a great exigent: *They were onely* (ſaith he) [n] *in a ſtate in which they might merit and increaſe in grace, till the time in which they were tranſlated: And as they were tranſlated, they were ſo confirmed in grace, that they can commit no ſinne: And to their old eſtate of meriting ſhall they return, when they ſhall live again amongſt men.* But who ever heard of ſuch turnings and returnings in any other men or Angels? or that their eſtate ſhall be changed from [o] *an eſtate wherein they cannot ſinne, to an eſtate in which they may ſinne?* and ſo backward? For ſuppoſing they ſhall live again, and die again; if they can merit, they can alſo ſinne whileſt they live among men: and ſo, when they die, and have their reward in heaven, this ſhall be no ſmall part of it, [p] *To have no power to ſinne.* But this opinion ſomewhat reſembleth the diverſified eſtate of devils, who *ſhall be ſaved after the generall judgement*, as Origen feigned and fabled; and which the Church hath branded for erroneous.

And now I ſee I have fallen, before I was aware, upon the fourth and laſt queſtion by me propounded, *Whether Enoch and Elias ſhall ever die, or do live with glorified bodies in the higheſt heavens?* which alſo I have anſwered at large, *That they never ſhall die, but do and ſhall live in glorified bodies.* Tertullian, I confeſſe, ſaid concerning Elias at the Transfiguration, [q] *He appeared in true fleſh which had never been ſeparated from its ſoul:* and more punctually, *de Anima cap.* 50. [r] *Enoch and Elias were tranſlated: nor is their death recorded, or known; it being adjourned: they are kept and preſerved that they may die hereafter, and by their bloud overthrow and extinguiſh Antichriſt*, as Baronius cites him. And the more common opinion of the Papiſts is, That

[n] *--in ſtatu merendi, & potuerunt in gratia creſcere, &c.*

[o] *A non poſſe peccare, ad poſſe peccare.*

[p] *Non poſſe peccare.*

[q] *Apparuit in veritate carnis nondum defunctæ*

[r] *Tranſlatus eſt Enoch & Elias, nec mors eorum reperta eſt; dilata ſcilicet: Morituri reſervantur, ut Antichriſtum ſanguine ſuo extinguant.*

That they two ſhall be ſlain: and they prove it by Rev. 11. 7. *When the two witneſſes ſhall have finiſhed their teſtimonie, the beaſt that aſcendeth out of the bottomleſſe pit, ſhall overcome, and kill them.* The three other places of Scripture, on which Bellarmine built his third demonſtration, that Antichriſt is not come, becauſe Enoch and Elias are not yet come, are anſwered before. This laſt place and paſſage of Scripture, uſed by Bellarmine, *de Romano Pontif.* 3.6. cometh now to be examined: and you ſhall finde it thus well winnowed by Biſhop Andrews, in his Anſwer to Cardinall Bellarmines Apologie, *Cap.* 11. That the *two witneſſes* are the two Teſtaments, as Beda, Primaſius, Auguſtinus, and Ticonius are Authours. S. Hilarius rejecteth Enoch, and puts Moſes in his room, and that very peremptorily: *Though many have ſubſtituted Jeremie in Enochs room,* ſaith Hilarie on Matth. Can. 20. S. Hierom, the next Father cited by Bellarmine, is not conſtant enough for Elias (which I touched at before:) and Rupertus, on Malach. 4. teſtifieth ſo much of Hierom: and Bullinger, *in Apocal. lib. 3. v. 3.* ſaith, *S. Hierom eſteemeth them to be Jews and Jewiſh hereticks, who think Elias ſhall come again.* Lactantius, cited by Bellarmine, in his Apologie, nameth neither Enoch, nor Elias. And Chryſoſtom, Theodoret, Origen, and Primaſius ſay nothing of Enoch. Hippolytus, for the two witneſſes, brings in three; one whereof is S. John the Divine: and indeed he is more likely to be one of the witneſſes, then Enoch; for unto him it was ſaid, Revel. 10. 11. *Thou muſt propheſie again before many peoples, and nations, and tongues, and kings:* but no ſuch thing was ſaid to Enoch. Others ſay, Elizeus ſhall be one of the two witneſſes. Hieronymus, ſaith, [r] *Unleſſe a man underſtand this place of the Revelation ſpiritually, he muſt needs ſettle and reſt on Jewiſh fables.* Maldonate on the 17 of Matthew, and his learned Interpreter, ſaith, It is ſo cleare a matter, that Moſes and Elias ſhall come, that none but a raſh and impudent man can denie it. Thus much Biſhop Andrews in his Anſwer to the place of the Revelation, againſt Bellarmines Apologie; who vaunted of a cloud of Fathers; which cloud is vaniſhed almoſt into nothing.

[r] *Niſi quis ſpiritualiter intelligat hunc locum Apocalypſeos, Judaicis ei fabulis acquieſcendum eſt.* In Epiſt. ad Marcellum.

Much more of great worth and conſequence hath that Reverend Biſhop, in the ſame 11 chapter, concerning Enoch and Elias, living in glorified bodies; to whom I referre the Reader. And this ſhall ſuffice to have ſpoken of Enoch, and of Elias, againſt Bellarmines third *demonſtration* (as he calleth it) that Antichriſt is not yet come. Every part and parcell of which proof is ſo weak, and ſo farre from concluding apodictically; that they ſcarce deſerve a place among probable arguments. And thus is the ſecond main branch of my anſwers made good and manifeſted, That ſome have been excepted from death, *viz.* Enoch and Elias; though it be objected, that

It

It is appointed for men to die. The third part of my answer followeth, That others also shall be excepted.

O Fountain of life, and preserver of men, to whom belong also the issues of death: I have deserved to die the first and second death, I have provoked thy long-suffering, I am no more worthy to be called thy sonne; Lord make me as one of thy hired servants, and put me to what labour, to what pain soever, within me, without me, so long as pleaseth thee: onely, I beseech thee for the blessed mediation of thy dearely beloved onely Sonne, Jesus Christ my Saviour, give me grace not to faint under the burthens appointed; and at the end of the day, at my lives end, vouchsafe to give me a penie among thy labourers, and eternall life among thy chosen. Amen.

CHAP. III.

1. *Some others hereafter shall be excepted from death. The* change *may be accounted, in a generall large sense, a kinde of* death. *The Papists will have a reall proper death: Aquinas, an incineration. This is disproved* 1. Thessal. 4. 17. *which place is handled at large. The rapture of the godly is* sine media morte, without death. *The resurrection is of all together. The righteous prevent not the wicked, in that.*

2. *By the words of the Creed is proved, that some shall never die. The same is confirmed by other places of Scripture; with the consent of S. Augustine, and Cajetan. The definitions* Ecclesiasticorum dogmatum, of the sentences and tenents of the Church, *leave the words doubtfully. Rabanus his exposition rejected.*

3. *The place of S. Paul,* 2. Corinth. 5. 4. *evinceth, That some shall not die. Cajetan with us, and against Aquinas. Doctour Estius, and Cornelius à Lapide the Jesuit, approve Cajetan. S. Augustine is on our side, and evinceth it by Adams estate before the fall; which state Bellarmine denieth not. Salmerons objections answered.*

4. *Some shall be exempted from death, as is manifested* 1. Corinth. 15.51. *The place fully explicated. The common Greek copies preferred. The Greek reading* πάντες μὲν οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα,

θα, We ſhall not all ſleep, *ſtandeth with all truth, conveniencie, probabilitie, and ſenſe.* *The other Greek,* πανΤες μὲν οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα, We ſhall therefore all of us ſleep, *and the more different Vulgat,* Omnes quidem reſurgemus, ſed non omnes immutabimur, Indeed we ſhall ariſe, but we ſhall not all be changed, *juſtly exploded, as adverſe to ſenſe.*

5. *The Pelagians, though accurſed hereticks, yet held truely, That ſome ſhall not die. S. Auguſtine dubious. Others ſtick in his heſitancie. Yet other Fathers and late Writers are conſtant, That ſome ſhall be priviledged from death; yet, that* change *may be called a kinde of* death.

1. THe third main queſtion being, *Whether Adam and his children, all and every one of them, without priviledge or exception; muſt and ſhall die?* I have firſt anſwered, and proved, that there may be an exception of ſome, who ſhall not die. Secondly, I have inſtanced in Enoch and Elias, That they have been excepted, and that they ſhall not die. I am now come to the third branch of my anſwer, That others alſo hereafter ſhall be excepted. In the avouchment of this truth conſiſteth the labour, till the end of this Chapter. And firſt of all, it muſt needs be acknowledged, That all and every one of thoſe, who might have been, or have been, or ſhall be excepted, may yet be ſaid, in a ſort, to die. [a] *The change which ſhall be in the twinkling of an eye, ſhall be in the room and ſtead of death,* ſaith Aretius. [b] *The immutation of them who ſhall be ſuddenly changed, ſhall be a kinde of death,* ſaith Beza. Boſquier, in his *Terror Orbis*, maketh *rapture* to be a kinde of *death*: we may more ſafely and properly call that *ſudden change,* by the name of *death.* For in this it ſhall be like death, That it ſhall take away from our bodies all corruptibilitie and mortalitie, together with the defects now annexed to them: and becauſe it altereth, if not aboliſheth the former ſtate or nature, it ſhall go for a kinde of death. But becauſe this change doth not ſeparate the ſoul from the bodie, doth not diſſolve the *compoſitum*; we are bold to ſay, It is not a true, proper, reall death.

a *Loco mortis erit momentanea commutatio.*
b *In illis qui repentè immutantur, immutatio illa erit ſpecies mortis.*

The Papiſts will not be content with this immutation; but urge a perfect naturall death, a very disjunct ſeparation of the ſoul from the bodie.

Aquinas goeth further, and will have an incineration of the bodies; from which duſt and aſhes, incorruptible bodies ſhall ariſe.

But

But this is confuted by the Apoſtle, 1. Theſſ. 4. 17. Ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες, οἱ περιλειπόμενοι, ἅμα σὺν αὐτοῖς ἁρπαγησόμεθα ἐν νεφέλαις, εἰς ἀπάντησιν τοῦ κυρίου εἰς ἀέρα. [c] *We who remain alive ſhall be hurried together in the clouds to meet the Lord in the aire*, as Montanus hath it. The Vulgat differeth but in word, not in ſenſe; [d] *We which are alive and remain, ſhall be caught up.* That the Apoſtle ſpeaketh not this of himſelf, and of his own perſon, is confeſſed. Occumenius citeth Methodius his opinion thus; and addeth his reaſon, *For S. Paul was not alive corporally to that time.* But it cometh more home, if we ſay (as well we may) that the bleſſed Apoſtle S. Paul knew that himſelf was none of them, who were to endure alive on earth, till the day of the generall judgement; becauſe he ſaith, 2. Tim. 4. 6. *I am now readie to be offered; and the time of my departure is at hand.* Yea, 2. Theſſ. 2. 2. he exhorteth the ſame Theſſalonians, That though ſeducers ſhould pretend his meſſage, or his letter; yet they ſhould not beleeve that Chriſts day was at hand. His own time was at hand, but Chriſts day was not. The Engliſh tranſlation jumpeth verbally in the contradiction; *At hand*, and, *Not at hand.* The Originall varieth but a little; and that not in ſenſe, nor in the Verb it ſelf, but the Prepoſition: and Montanus hath the word, *Inſtat*, by way of expoſition in both places. [e] *But he inſtanceth in his own perſon*, ſaith Methodius. That he ſpeaketh it onely of the godly, is alſo apparent by the context: for the word περιλειπόμενοι, *we the remainder*, ſheweth, that a few ſhall be left at that time: and if he had ſpoken of the wicked; perhaps, he would not have put in himſelf, and other holy ones; he would not have ſaid *Rapiemur, We ſhall be taken up*; but *Rapientur, They ſhall be taken up.* Again, when he ſaith, *Rapiemur cum illis, We ſhall be taken up with them*; who are meant in thoſe words, ſave they onely *who ſleep in Jeſus*, and *whom God will bring with him*, 1. Theſſ. 4. 14? which are not the wicked, but the godly onely. They are the *Saints*, with whom *the Lord cometh*, Jude ver. 14.

The Rhemiſts themſelves confeſſe, that the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of all the faithfull then living, when Chriſt cometh to the laſt judgement. *Diodorus* (as it is in Hierom) *ſaith, The Apoſtle* [f] *ſaid WE, that is, they who are juſt: out of whoſe number I am not excluded.* A powerfull reaſon may confirm this: becauſe the wicked will wiſh mountains to cover them, will quake and tremble at that houre, and would not be willing to come to judgement, if they could avoid it. Therefore it is not likely that they would ſpring forth, and put themſelves forward to meet the Lord.

The ſumme is, The godly which ſhall be then left, and be alive, ſhall be taken up into the aire. The Papiſts ſay, this is not to be done, [g] *without intercurrent*, or *intercedent death:*

[c] *Nos viventes relicti, ſimul cum illis rapiemur in nubibus in occurſum Domini in aera.*

[d] *Qui vivimus, qui relinquimur, &c.*

[e] *Sed ſuam perſonam verbi gratiâ profert.*

[f] *Apoſtolus* Nos *dixit, pro eo quod juſtos; de quorum & ego ſum numero.*

[g] *Sine media morte.*

whereas the words are expreſſe, *We living, and remaining, ſhall be ſnatched up.* The argument of Gregorie de Valentia hath pith in it. For he ſaith, *If the live men do die,* [h] *it followeth that the juſt ſhall ariſe ſomewhat after others: for they ſhall both die and riſe again.* Which opinion, becauſe it is againſt all Divinitie, he minceth and mollifieth thus, [i] *All may be ſaid to ariſe together: as that may be ſaid to be done at once, which is done in a very ſhort time.* But this ſhift cannot ſerve his turn: for, ἐν ἀτόμῳ, ἐν ῥιπῇ ὀφθαλμοῦ (1. Corinth. 15. 52.) *in puncto*, or *in tempore indiviſibili*, *in one inſtant*, is neither firſt nor laſt. But ſo ſhall all ariſe: and Bonaventure, *Sentent. 4. diſtinct. 43. quaſt. 3.* proveth by ſix reaſons, that [k] *There ſhall be a joynt reſurrection of all together, and not ſucceſsive*, as Valentia would have it. The frame may be this, from his confeſſion, *The righteous ſhall not ariſe after others: But, by Valentia his acknowledgement, if the righteous, who ſhall be alive when Chriſt cometh, ſhall die; they muſt ariſe after others: Therefore they ſhall not die at all.* Though it be ſaid, 1. Theſſ. 4. 16. *The dead in Chriſt ſhall ariſe firſt*, yet he ſaith not, he meaneth not, that they ſhall ariſe ſooner then other men (much leſſe later, as the Jeſuit would featly excuſe it:) for all ſhall be raiſed together, good and bad, at the blowing of the trump: *All that are in the graves ſhall heare Chriſts voice* (one voice, one ſingle voice ſhall be heard of all) *and ſhall come forth: they that have done good, unto the reſurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the reſurrection of damnation*, John 5. 28, 29. They muſt not come forth one by one, or one after another; but all together. And not onely they who are dead, ſhall all ariſe together: but at the ſame time ſhall both the dead be raiſed, and the living changed: * *For this we ſay unto you by the word of the Lord* (perhaps, ſome of the words which he heard in the third heaven) *that we which are alive, and remain unto the coming of the Lord ſhall not prevent them which are aſleep:* And there is no likelihood that the dead ſhall prevent the living: Therefore all ſhall ariſe, or be changed together. *The Lord ſhall deſcend from heaven with a ſhout, with the voice of the Archangel, and with the trump*, 1. Theſſ. 4. 16. *With a great ſound of a trumpet*, Matth. 24. 31. *The trumpet ſhall ſound, and the dead ſhall be raiſed incorruptible, and we ſhall be changed*, 1. Cor. 15. 52. All this ſhall be done at one time, the *change* of ſome, and the *reſurrection* of others. No preeminence is in that point. Though the Apoſtle ſaith, *The dead in Chriſt ſhall ariſe firſt*; it is meant, before others ſhall meet Chriſt in the aire. [l] *For he ſetteth not down the order of their ſeverall reſurrections, but the order of their ſeverall raptures and meetings with Chriſt*, ſaith the deep Aquinas. The raiſed and changed holy ones ſhall go together: the changed ſhall not meet Chriſt, till firſt the holy dead be raiſed.

Again,

[h] *Sequitur juſtos aliquantò poſt reſurrecturos, quàm alios: ſiquidem morientur, atque adeò reſurgent.*

[i] *Omnes poſſunt dici reſurgere ſimul, prout ſimul fieri dici poteſt, quod ſit ſub idem tempus breviſſimum.*

[k] *Reſurrectio omnium ſit ſimul, & non ſucceſſivè.*

* 1. Theſſ. 4. 15.

[l] *Non enim ponit ordinem reſurrectionis ad reſurrectionem, ſed ordinem ad raptum vel occurrentiam.*

Again, it is not, *Resurgent primi*, *Shall be the first who arise*, which is the bad translation of the Vulgat; but ἀναστήσονται πρῶτον, *Resurgent primùm*, *Shall arise first of all*, adverbially; *first*, that is, before others meet Christ. S. Augustine was sometimes doubtfull of the main point: but what saith he, *Tomo* 4. *de octo Dulcitii quæstionibus*, *quæst.* 3. upon these words, *WE WHO LIVE AND ARE LEFT? I would* (saith he) *heare more learned men concerning these words, and correct what I have sometimes thought otherwise, from hence; if they can be so expounded to me, as by them I may understand, that all who live now, or shall live, shall die.— But if in these words there can no other sense be found; and if it be cleare, that the Apostle would be understood, according to the evidence of the words, That there shall be some living in the end of the world,* [1] *who shall not die corporally, but be clothed over with immortalitie, that mortalitie may be swallowed up of life; then to this opinion, without doubt, is agreeable that which in our Belief we confesse, That Christ shall come to judge both quick and dead.* So farre proceedeth that holy Father S. Augustine.

[1] *Qui non expolientur corpore, sed superinduantur immortalitate, ut absorbeatur mortale à vita.*

2. And becausé he hath named a second place, and instanceth in the Creed; it shall be my second argument; and thus do I shape it; The Creed Apostolicall saith, *Christ shall judge both the quick and the dead. He was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead*, saith S. Peter, Act. 10. 42. S. Paul hath the same, 2. Timoth. 4. 1. *Testificor coram Jesu Christo, qui judicaturus est vivos & mortuos, I testifie before Jesus Christ who shall judge the quick and the dead*; And when the Scriptures say so, *they understand it* [a] *of the last generall judgement*, saith Bellarm. *de Purgat.* 2. 4. Yea the Apostle expresseth so much in the last cited verse of Timothie; *Christ shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing, and his Kingdome.* But his Kingdome was not of this world, and his first appearing was past; Therefore it must be at his second coming. The ground-work of the words being laid, thus the structure ariseth. By the word, *dead*, you cannot understand the parties as they are dead; for so Christ judgeth them not; alive people are the object of his judgement: But you must needs expound *dead* for those, that sometimes did die and now are raised to be judged, and are alive. The word *quick*, or *living*, you cannot interpret, as the Papists do, *such as are alive then, and shall die; and then be raised; and then be judged:* for it needed not to have been said, *He shall judge the quick and the dead*; but it had been sufficient to have said onely one of them, *He shall judge the quick*, or *the living*; for indeed they shall all be alive: or, *He shall judge the dead*; for even the living, and the quick shall die, as the Papists feigne. But indeed the Holy Writ divides all mankinde into two sorts: the one part shall be living, and not die, but be changed; the other are such, as sometimes died: *Viventes, & mortuos.* And thus there are no clouds in that article, *He shall judge the quick and the dead.*

[a] *De novissimo generali judicio.*

In the Creed there is neither redundancie, nor defect: in the Popiſh expoſition there is redundancie: for, if all and every one ſhall die, it might as well have been expreſſed, *He ſhall judge the dead:* Or, if the dead, as dead, be not properly judged; it might onely have been ſaid, *He ſhall judge the quick:* for, according to the Papiſts, all the living ſhall die, and be again made quick. But, as I ſaid, the ſpecializing of two ſorts, *quick* and *dead*, evinceth, that ſome ſhall not die, and ſome have died.

Theſe words of the Creed did much move Cajetan, as himſelf confeſſeth; and they are brought by S. Auguſtine to eſtabliſh this point, That ſome ſhall not *die*, but ſhall be *changed:* though I confeſſe, the definitions *Eccleſiaſticorum Dogmatum*, *cap.* 8. leave it doubtfull. For thus they ſay, [a] *What is ſaid in the Creed, That Chriſt at his coming ſhall judge the quick and the dead, we beleeve doth ſignifie, that not onely the juſt, but the ſinners alſo ſhall be judged. And even thoſe alſo who ſhall be found alive in their bodies of fleſh; of whom our belief is, that they ſhall yet die, or, as others think, be changed: that being raiſed immediately, or changed, they may be judged with thoſe who died before*: And yet, me thinks, another expoſition of Ruffinus is as bad: for *quick and dead* he underſtandeth of *ſouls and bodies*; As if the ſouls were not ſentenced before, in the particular judgement; as if the bodies were then dead, or to be dead, when they are judged.

[a] *Quod dicimus in ſymbolo*, in advẽtu Domini vivos & mortuos judicandos, *non ſolùm juſtos & peccatores ſignificari credimus; ſed & vivos eos, qui in carne invenienai ſunt: qui adhuc morituri creduntur, vel immutandi ſunt, ut alii volunt; ut ſuſcitati continuò, vel reformati, cum antè mortuis judicentur.*

3. I have not yet ended with the words of the great S. Auguſtine: but from the phraſes uſed by him, out of the Holy Writ, of *Expoliari*, & *Superindui*, *To be unclothed*, and *clothed upon*, I thus frame another argument.

S. Paul ſaith, 2. Corinth. 5. 4. οὐ θέλομεν ἐκδύσασθαι, ἀλλ' ἐπενδύσασθαι, ἵνα καταποθῇ τὸ θνητὸν ὑπὸ τῆς ζωῆς, *We would not be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortalitie might be ſwallowed up of life.* He, who is not *unclothed*, but *clothed upon*, holdeth what he had, layeth down nothing, and hath ſomewhat added to him. But by this garment, Metaphorically, is the bodie meant, which ſhall not be caſt off from the ſoul, or the ſoul from it; but in the change ſhall be arayed with immortalitie.

Now if there be not an expoliation, if there be not a ſeparation of the ſoul from the bodie; there is no death: But there is no ſuch expoliation: therefore they who have other clothing put upon them, ſhall not die. Cajetan, upon the words *SUPERINDUI CUPIENTES, DESIRING TO BE CLOTHED UPON &c.* ſaith, *The ſame ſhall truly befall us,* [b] *if at Chriſts coming we ſhall be found clothed with our bodies, and not naked: that is, if we ſhall then remain alive, and not be dead before.* And the ſame Cajetan confuteth Aquinas his expoſition, on the place. Doctour Eſtius approveth Cajetan; and ſo doth Cornelius Cornelii à Lapide, on the words.

[b] *Si in die Domini, veſtiti corpore, & non nudi, inventi fuerimus; id eſt, ſi tunc reſidui futuri ſumus, & nondum mortui.*

Lorinus on Act. 10. and Juſtinian upon theſe paſſages of S. Paul,

Paul, will by no means cenſure our opinion, as Catharinus and Soto do: and this they profeſſe, though they be Jeſuits. For indeed our opinion is confirmed by S. Auguſtine, *de peccatorum meritis & remiſs.* 1.2. [c] *If Adam had not ſinned, his ſoul had never been diſunited from his bodie, but he had been clothed upon with immortalitie, and incorruption: ſo that the mortall part ſhould have been ſwallowed up of life, that is, ſhould be changed from a carnall life into a ſpirituall.* Otherwhere S. Auguſtine ſaith, *Adam had a ſtate, by which he might paſſe from mortalitie to immortalitie without taſting or partaking of death.* Bellarmine ſpeaking of Adam, citeth this, and liketh it. Why therefore may not they, that ſhall be *reſidui, left*, be alſo without death tranſlated into glorie? If the Jeſuits had had ſuch an argument, they would have ſaid, It were convenient for God ſo to do it, yea neceſſarie; that by plain demonſtration mankinde might ſee and know, what eſtate they had, and what eſtate ſometimes they loſt in Adam; and that all mankinde ſhould have been ſo tranſlated, if ſinne had not hindered, and thruſt death among us. I will onely ſay, It may be, that ſome are therefore kept to be tranſlated, to ſhew the manner how Adam without death ſhould have been changed.

Salmeron objecteth, *Children found alive at that time, if they die not, ſhall continue in the ſame ſtature: which may not be beleeved.* I anſwer, he derogateth from the power of God: as if he were not able to make *children* to be *men* by the *change*, as he is able by *death*. Can God make *children* of *ſtones*? and can he not make *men* of *children*? Did he create Adam to be a full grown man, of earth? and will his hand be ſhortned in the immutation? God, out of the little duſt of little children, raiſeth up, by Salmerons confeſſion, intire, perfect bodies of men: therefore the ſame God may as well, as eaſily, and perhaps more eaſily, (if God doth ſuch things more eaſily, then other) of the ſame living bodies of little children, by that myſterious change, produce and ampliate every member to the full growth of perfect men. God cauſed the rod of Aaron to bud; *and it brought forth buds, and bloomed bloſſomes, and yeelded almonds*, Numb. 17. 8. and yet it was ſevered from the root; and laid up in the Tabernacle of the Congregation, before the teſtimonie; free from water, or earth, to nouriſh it: and this was done the morrow after it was there laid: though it would not have born almonds, if it had been ſtill united to the ſtock; perhaps, for many moneths after. Did the ſame God reſtore unto Jeroboam, his hand which was dried up before, *ſo that he could not pull it back to him again*, 1. Kings, 13. 4. and that on a ſudden, at the prayer of the Prophet? And will Salmeron think, that if children do not die, they ſhall continue ſtill children, although they be changed? Who knoweth not, that the *change* is as great a part of Gods power, as the *reſurrection*?

[c] *Si non peccâſſet Adam, non erat expoliandus corpore, ſed ſuperveſtiendus immortalitate & incorruptione, ut abſorberetur mortale à vita, id eſt, ab animali in ſpirituale tranſiret.*

Salmeron again objecteth, *If the living or quick at that day, ſhall not die; The wicked ones* [d] *ſhall avoid the fire of conflagration.* I anſwer firſt, That the fire of conflagration ſhall be after judgement. Secondly, if they ſhould eſcape that fire, they cannot flee from the fire of hell. Thirdly, the wicked ones ſhall ariſe with the juſt, all together. The wicked ones may be changed alſo at the ſame inſtant, that the juſt are; and that is, at the ſame inſtant of the reſurrection. *Chriſt is the reſurrection, and the life*, John 11. 25. The *reſurrection*, to them that are *dead*: perhaps the *life* to them that are *changed*, and *die not*. The reſurrection of the *dead Saints*, is called *the reſurrection unto life*; The reſurrection of the *dead wicked ones*, is called *the reſurrection unto damnation*, John 5.28. Likewiſe, ſay I, The *change of the wicked*, (if changed they be, as I hold it moſt likely) may be called *the change unto ſhame and pain eternall*; as the *change of the godly*, may be called *a change unto glorie*. For the wicked ſhall reap no benefit by that change: nor ſhall they meet Chriſt in the aire, by any extraordinarie rapture, as I conceive. And ſince they die the ſecond death; it mattereth not, if they avoid, either the firſt death, by immutation; or the fire of conflagration. Laſtly, if they ſhall meet Chriſt in the aire, it is to their greater terrour: They ſhall be hurried to their judge, and haled toward their puniſhment: they meet him not, as he is *a milde Saviour*; but as *an angrie and juſt God*. And this is a ſufficient anſwer both to the ſecond and third objection of Salmeron; as the learned, who reade him, can teſtifie.

[d] *Ignem conflagrationis evadent.*

4. Another argument, and that of moment and validitie, to prove that ſome ſhall hereafter be excepted from death, is taken from that memorable, diverſly read, diverſly expounded place of the Apoſtle, 1. Corinth. 15. 51. πάντες μὲν οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα, πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα, [e] *We ſhall not all die, but we ſhall all be changed*; as the Interlinearie hath it. And this is the firſt, and beſt reading. Let us examine, firſt the words, and the ſeverall tranſlations; and ſo approach to the expoſition.

[e] *Omnes autem non dormiemus, omnes autem immutabimur.*

The Greek cited by me at large, is in all the Greek copies: ſo ſaith Peter Martyr; and Doctour Eſtius confirmeth the ſame: ſo likewiſe doth Chryſoſtom, and Theophylact reade it: and Theodoret, and Juſtinus *ad Orthodoxos, quæſt. 61. & quæſt. 109.* and Origen, *in tertio volumine enarrationis Epiſtolæ primæ ad Theſſalonicenſes*, as alſo in his book againſt Marcion, *Which is a manuſcript in the Vatican*, ſaith Eſtius. So Oecumenius, *Prognoſt.* 3.48. *So Theodorus Heracleotes reades it*, ſaith S. Hierom, *in Tom. 3. Epiſtolarum, pag.* 198. and in the end of the ſame Epiſtle to Minerius and Alexander, S. Hierom acknowledgeth, that even in his dayes the Greeks did not reade it as the Latines. Salmeron on the place, findes fault with, πάντες μὲν οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα, *Omnes quidem non dormiemus, All of us ſhall not die:* [f] *which, according*

[f] *Quod, juxta verborum proprietatem, perinde eſt ac dicere, Nullos dormituros: non enim dicitur*, Non omnes dormiemus, *quâ declararet, aliquos non morituros. Eſt grande diſcrimen apud Logicos inter* Non omnes dormiemus, *&*, Omnes non dormiemus.

to

to the proprietie of the words, is as if he had ſaid, NONE SHALL DIE. For it is not ſaid, NOT ALL OF US SHALL DIE, by which words is meant and declared, that ſome ſhall not die. And there is a great difference among Logicians betweene theſe two propoſitions, NOT ALL OF US SHALL DIE, and, ALL OF US SHALL NOT DIE. So farre he.

First, I ſay, Eſtius a learned Doctour, and Popiſh Divine, doth sleight this ſubtiltie: [g] *Know* (ſaith he) *that the ſenſe is no whit changed or altered, whether you reade it thus, ALL OF US SHALL NOT DIE, as the order of the words is in the Greek text: or thus, NOT ALL OF US SHALL DIE, as Hierom reades it, and moſt of the Latines interpret it.*

Secondly, I ſay, if we ſhould maintain that none ſhall die of them that are *reſidui, then remaining alive*; but that both good and bad, ſhall all be changed without death; I ſee no inconvenience to ariſe from that opinion.

Catharinus, in his Commentaries, findes fault with thoſe, who follow the firſt reading, πάντες μὲν ἀ κοιμηθησόμεθα· but Eſtius findes fault with him for his fault finding; condemning him of inconſideration, and raſhnes. The Arabick accordeth with the Greek; *Nos omnes non moriemur, ſed nos omnes mutabimur, We all ſhall not die, but we all ſhall be changed.* The Syriack alſo is in harmonie with both Greek and Arabick (though Salmerons nicetie may think it a jarre) *Non omnes nos obdormiemus, omnes autem nos immutabimur; Not all we ſhall ſleep, but all we ſhall be changed:* yea, *an old vulgat tranſlation, which is in Baſil in the librarie of the Predicants* (ſaith Eraſmus) *agreeth with our Greek.* Aquinas himſelf, in the end of his 8. Lect. confeſſeth, that our Greek reading is in ſenſe conſonant to that which the Apoſtle wrote to the Theſſalonians, the firſt Epiſt. 4 chap. and 17 verſe. Scriptures ſweetly expound Scripture: *We ſhall not all ſleep, but we ſhall all be changed*, ſaith the Apoſtle here: and to the Theſſalonians, *We which are alive, and remain, ſhall be caught up together.* The very Prefaces have a correſpondence in ſubſtance, and are more then ordinarie; *This we ſay unto you by the word of the Lord*, 1. Theſſal. 4. 15. and here, 1. Corinth. 15. 51. *Behold, I ſhew you a myſterie:* And then doth he in both places evince an immutation, without death. Therefore there can be no danger in our opinion; as may be evinced from Aquinas his free acknowledgement. Yea, there is not onely no danger, but great reaſon for it: for, How excellently doth this agree with that, which preſently followeth, verſe 52. *The dead ſhall be raiſed incorruptible, and we ſhall be changed.* Doth he not plainly diſcriminate and diverſifie thoſe, which ſhall be *raiſed*, from thoſe which ſhall be *changed?* He doth not ſay, *We ſhall be raiſed incorruptible*, and, *We ſhall be changed*; as he muſt have done, if all are to die, and then to be changed: And, to ſhew that the change is not by laying down

[g] *Scito ſenſum non mutari, ſive legas*, Omnes quidem non dormiemus, *qui ordo verborum eſt in Graco: ſive*, Non omnes quidem dormiemus, *quomodo legit Hieronymus, & plerique Latini vertunt.*

of the bodie, he addeth immediately, *This corruptible muſt put on incorruption, and this mortall muſt put on immortalitie*, verſ. 53. phraſes implying no *loſſe*, no *decay*, no *ſeparation*; but a *ſuperinduction*, and *ſuperaddition* to what before was enjoyed. And when this is done, he ſaith moſt pertinently, verſ. 54. *Then ſhall be brought to paſſe the ſaying that is written, Death is ſwallowed up in victorie*: as if he had ſaid, *When both theſe things are accompliſhed, the raiſing of the dead, and the change of the living, ſo that they ſhall be no more mortall; then ſhall death be overcome: O DEATH, WHERE IS THY STING?* verſ. 55.

So much for the firſt and beſt reading, πάντες μὲν οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα. I come to the ſecond (which is varied by the addition of one letter; but it makes a contrarietie in the ſenſe) πάντες μὲν οὖν κοιμηθησόμεθα. *Omnes non dormiemus, All of us ſhall not ſleep*, ſaith the former: *Omnes dormiemus, All of us ſhall ſleep*, ſaith the latter. And this latter way it ſeemeth to have been read in ſome few copies, even in S. Hieroms time. But *this Greek lection is juſtly ſuſpected* (ſaith the worthy Eſtius;) *the Greek* οὐ *being ſo eaſily turned into* οὖν *by the addition of* ν, *or a little daſh*. And he findeth juſt fault with Acacius in Hierom, for ſaying it was ſo read in moſt Greek copies; when as, certainly it was read ſo but in verie few copies; whereof there is ſcarce one now extant, and not many proofs that ever there were many copies of that extant. Neither indeed doth the reading ſtand with ſenſe. For the Apoſtle ſolemnly premizeth, *Behold, I ſhew you a myſterie*: and then ſubjoyneth immediately, according to this new-fangled miſ-writing, *We ſhall all therefore ſleep*, or *die*. Is this a myſterie, that all ſhall ſleep, or all die? Doth he promiſe *mountains*, and bring forth a *molehill*? Every Heathen knows, that we ſhall die; every Chriſtian, Turk, and Jew, that we ſhall be raiſed again. But, when God juſtly for ſinne ſentenced man to death with a *morte morieris*, That ſome ſinfull men ſhould be excepted, is a myſterie, deſerving ſuch a watchword, as *Behold: Behold, I ſhew you a myſterie; we ſhall not all ſleep, but we ſhall all be changed.*

Secondly, from the word κοιμηθησόμεθα, I thus argue: That death (if ſuch a death there be any) which is ſo ſpeedily begun, by ſeparation of the ſoul from the bodie, and ended (as I may ſo ſay) by the ſwift and momentanie reuniting of the ſame ſoul to the ſame bodie, cannot handſomely be called a *ſleep*. Doth he ſleep, who in the twinkling of an eye is changed from mortalitie to immortalitie? yea, from being alive, is made dead? and from being dead, is made alive; and that incorruptibly? Was ever ſleep confined to an inſtant, till now? or may one be ſaid to ſleep, in the midſt of theſe great works? It is not ſo much as Analogicall ſleep. The greateſt ſleepers have more then an inſtant, ere they can begin to ſleep. Sleep creep-

creepeth or falleth on men by degrees; heavineſſe and dulneſſe uſher it; and the ſpirits have a time to retire to their forts, and cittadels; the ſenſes are not locked up, nor do they depoſite the uſe of their faculties in a moment. And may that be called properly *reſt*, or *ſleep*, which reſteth not above an inſtant, and is as quick as thought? Reſt and ſleep do couch upon the bed of time: likewiſe it is as much as poſſibly can be done, (if ſo much can be done) to awake one in an inſtant. The Scripture uſeth the phraſe of *ſleeping* towards them, who reſt (as it were) in death, in the earth, in the grave: *Our friend Lazarus ſleepeth*, ſaith Chriſt, John 11.11. when indeed he was buried. *Many of them that ſleep in the duſt of the earth, ſhall awake*, Dan.12.2. Let one place of holy Writ be produced, where one and the ſame inſtant beginneth ſleep, and endeth awaking; and then I may ſay, there may be ſome ſhadow for that reading. But here is no pauſe, no reſt, no quiet; therefore no ſleep: therefore the word *ſleep* in this place, is applied to ſuch as died before; and not to ſuch as are alive, and ſhall die; as the ſecond lection implieth.

Thirdly, it wanteth force, to ſay in the whole conjoyned ſentence, *We ſhall therefore all ſleep*, or *die*; *but we ſhall all be changed*. If the Apoſtle had intended any ſuch thing, he would not have uſed the adverſative particle *But*; but the implicative word *And: We ſhall all therefore ſleep*; *AND we ſhall all be changed*. This had been ſenſe, if thus it had been: but not being ſo, we may the more confidently ſhake off the ſecond lection, of πάντες μὲν, as abhorrent from reaſon; and cleave to the firſt, of πάντες μὲν οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα, *Omnes quidem non dormiemus, &c. All we ſhall not die, but all we ſhall be changed.*

And ſo, from the varietie of Greek copies, I come to the Vulgat, the Tranſlation in Latine, *Omnes quidem reſurgemus, ſed non omnes immutabimur*; *Truely we ſhall all of us ariſe, but we ſhall not all of us be changed.*

Firſt, I ſay, this differeth from all Greek copies; whereas, if it had been according to any ſort of them, it might have ſwayed us much that way.

Secondly, the ſame argument toucht at before, may alſo give a ſide-blow to this tranſlation. The Apoſtle raiſeth up their conſiderations, by promiſing to tell them a myſterie: But it was no myſterie to tell them, that they ſhould all be raiſed; when he had told it ſo pithily, ſo divinely, and ſo often beat upon it before, by ſo many kindes of arguments, as he did.

Thirdly, where the Vulgat ſaith, *Non omnes immutabimur*; it is not true: for *Omnes immutabimur, We ſhall all be changed*, from *mortalitie* to *immortalitie*, from *naturall bodies* to *ſpirituall*. If you ſay, We ſhall not be all changed to glorie; I ſay ſo with

with you: I adde, That is no myſterie; all know that. Therefore the Apoſtle ſpeaketh not of a change to glorie eternall in the heavens; whereunto ſome onely ſhall be changed; but he ſpeaketh of a change from *mortalitie* to *immortalitie*, from *corruptible bodies* to *incorruptible*; which even the wickedeſt men ſhall have. And perhaps he meaneth, that this generall immutation ſhall be made, *ſine media morte, without intercurrent*, or *intercedent death*, even in the wicked that ſhall be then alive: yet in the change, you muſt alwaies make this diverſitie: The wicked ſhall be ſingled out to ſhame, to loſſe, to puniſhment eternall, with their raiſed or changed bodies (for even in their raiſing alſo, there is a change from corruption to incorruption:) but in the change of the godly, there is glorious incorruption, joyfull immortalitie, pleaſurable eternitie.

The word ἀλλαγησόμεθα ſignifieth a change of a thing from place to place; as when we take a piece of wood from the earth, and caſt it into the water: Thus the wicked ſhall be hurried from their graves to the judgement ſeat; and ſhall be placed on the left hand of our Saviour; and, after ſentence, ſhall be haled, and caſt from earth into hell. On the other ſide, the righteous in their change ſhall be mounted up from their graves, or from the earth, into the aire, to meet Chriſt; and ſhall be at his right hand; and, after ſentence, be carried or aſcend up into heaven, in moſt glorious manner, to live with Chriſt eternally.

Fourthly, if we reade it with the Vulgat, *We ſhall all ariſe, but we ſhall not all be changed*; we muſt alſo immediately annex the words, *In a moment, in the twinkling of an eie, at the laſt trump:* for there is the pauſe, and ſtay to be made; there is the full ſentence. The Vulgat hath done very ill, to make the ſtay and full point at *immutabimur:* for then the words following bear no conſtruction at all, if they be conſidered by themſelves; *In a moment, in the twinkling of an eie, at the laſt trump.* For then cometh in new matter; *For the trumpet ſhall ſound, and the dead ſhall be raiſed incorruptible, and we ſhall be changed: For this corruptible muſt put on incorruption, &c.* What coherence ſubſequent then ſhall you make unto theſe words? None at all. The coherence muſt be with the antecedent words. But, ſay I, take the antecedent words, as the Vulgat hath them; and reade, as you muſt, the connexion in this ſort, *We ſhall indeed all ariſe: but ſhall not all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the laſt trump: For the trumpet ſhall ſound, &c.* I ſay, even in this reading there is little ſenſe alſo; yea, much untruth. Is it not certain that we ſhall be changed in a moment? Or how long ſhall the time of change be? There is no way to avoid this foul abſurditie, which cometh by the Vulgat edition; unleſſe it be by a greater, that

is,

is, by saying that you will make an Hyperbaton; and include these words, *We shall not all be changed*, in a Parenthesis: and then the sense will be, *We shall arise in a moment, &c.* For, though it be true, that we shall arise in a moment; yet there is no ground, that we shall not be changed in a moment. In all likelihood, a change may rather be more speedie, which is without death; then that change which is made through death and resurrection. If they may be, and shall be raised, and changed in a moment; they may in a moment be changed, and not raised.

Secondly, no authoritie, that I know, runneth for such a needlesse Parenthesis: and I deem it as a violence offered to the Text, so to strain it, when the sense will runne fairly otherwise, according to the best Greek copies; *We shall not all sleep; but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump.*

Let this also serve to have been spoken against the Latin Vulgat edition, and its bad reading, *Omnes quidem resurgemus: sed non omnes immutabimur. In momento, in ictu oculi, in novissima tuba, canet enim tuba, & mortui resurgent incorrupti, &c.* By how much the lesse sense is in this; by so much the more are we bound to adhere to the Originall, and the most common and best copies of it.

This I may be bold to averre, That if some shall not die, and yet be changed; there shall be an infallible, yea demonstrative proof unto sense, That the very self same bodie which man had, shall inherit eternall glorie. For, if they die not, they must needs keep and have the same bodies, from which they are not parted by immutation. Yea, the identicall resurrection of the same very bodies which were dead, may thus farre be proved, That if the *changed bodies* shall be still the same in *substance*, though differing in *qualities*; the *raised bodies* also shall be no otherwise, nor any way different: and Pythagoras will then disprove his * *transmigration of souls into diverse bodies*, and his heathenish * *regeneration* (to which Nicodemus seemed to have an eye, Joh. 3. 4.) when every soul cometh arayed with its own bodie; and when they, who by change put not off their bodies, shall come alive to judgement.

* Μετεμψυχωσιν.
* Παλιγγενεσιαν.

5. The Pelagians were wont thus to argue, If sinne came in by Adam, then all must needs die: But some shall not die, namely those, † *who shall be found remaining alive*: Therefore sinne came not into the world by Adam. S. Augustine answereth this argument very sufficiently otherwise: and it may easily and briefly be answered, All shall die *reatu*, though not *actu*. Yet that holy Father, and that great just enemie of the accursed Pelagians, ‡ *for the greater and better securitie and safetie*, would seem to rest doubtfull of their assumption; which he

† Qui reperientur vivi.

‡ In majorem cautelam.

he needed not. Whereupon, *de Civitat.* 20. 20. he ſaith, [a] *Death goeth before; a moſt ſhort and ſpeedie one, yet a death.* And in the ſame place, [b] *They ſhall ſlip, ſail, or paſſe over by death to immortalitie with wonderfull ſpeed.* Again, *de peccat. merit. & remiſſ.* 2. 31. [c] *God at the end of the world ſhall grant this priviledge unto ſome, That by reaſon of their ſudden change they ſhall not feel death.* And, *Retract.* 2. 33. [d] *Either they die not, or otherwiſe they glide from this life into death, and from death into eternall life, as it were, in the twinkling of an eye, by a moſt ſpeedie alteration, taking no notice or ſenſe of death.* He leaves it doubtfull (as you ſee) in theſe his laſt books: though ſometimes before he thought, That all ſhould die; and otherwhere, as *ad Dulcitium, quæſt.* 3. That they ſhould not die.

The Maſter of the Sentences ſaith concerning the queſtion, Whether the change be by death, or without it, [e] *Man cannot determine certainly which of theſe is trueſt.* Rabanus, *lib.* 4. *de ſermon. proprietat.* having alledged the conſent of divers Fathers to eſtabliſh his own opinion, *That all muſt die*; yet annexeth this, *Becauſe there are others alike Catholick and learned men, who beleeve, That, the ſoul remaining in the bodie, thoſe ſhall be changed to immortalitie, who ſhall be found alive at the coming of our Lord*; [f] *and that it ſtands them in ſtead of riſing from the dead, that they caſt away mortalitie by change, not by death*; *Let any man reſt on which opinion he pleaſeth, &c.* Which very words alſo, you ſhall finde in the book *de Eccleſiaſt. Dogmat. cap.* 7. Now though S. Auguſtine was dubious, and ſome with him; and though ſome alſo have imbraced the contrary opinion: yet equally Catholick and learned men have been conſtant to maintain, That ſome ſhall not *die*, but be *changed*; as you have heard confeſſed.

If you pleaſe, you may take a view of ſome, more particularly. The afore named Theodorus Heracleotes, cited by Hierom, in his epiſtle to Minerius and Alexander, hath it thus; [i] *The Saints, who in the day of the laſt judgement ſhall be found to be alive and remain in their earthly bodies, ſhall not ſee death, or taſte of it; and ſhall be with the Lord, kicking and ſpurning at death and the greateſt inforcing neceſſitie thereof.* Apollinaris, cited in the ſame epiſtle, ſaid, *Some ſhall not die; but be ſnatcht out of this life, that with changed, and glorified bodies, they might be with Chriſt.* Chryſoſtom on the 10. to the Romanes, and on 1. Theſſ. 4. and upon this place to the Corinthians, ſaith, *Some ſhall eſcape death.* With him agreeth Epiphanius, *Hæreſi* 64. ſaying, [k] *Who is ſuddenly ſnatched up, is not yet dead.* And before them, Origen, *lib.* 2. *contra Celſum*, ſo opineth. Theophylact on 1. Corinth. 15. thus, [l] *Even they who ſhall not die, ſhall be tranſchanged out of this corruptible life, to incorruptibilitie:* And again, [m] *Some indeed ſhall not die at all.* To that effect S. Hierom in his epiſtle to Marcella, *quæſt.* 3. *num.*

[a] *Dormitio præcedit, quamvis breviſſima, non tamen nulla.*
[b] *Per mortem ad immortalitatem mirâ celeritate tranſibunt.*
[c] *Hoc quibuſdam in fine largietur Deus, ut mortem iſtam repentinâ commutatione non ſentiant.*
[d] *Aut non morientur, aut de vita iſta in mortem, & de morte in æternam vitam, celerrimâ commutatione, tanquam in ictu oculi tranſeundo, mortem non ſenticut.*
[e] *Horum quid ſit verius, non eſt humani judicii definire.*
[f] *Et hoc eis reputari pro reſurrectione ex mortuis, quòd mortalitatem immutatione deponant, non morte, &c.*
[i] *Sancti, qui in die judicii in corporibus reperiendi ſunt, non guſtabunt mortem; eruntque cum Domino, graviſſimâ mortis neceſſitate calcatâ.*
[k] *Qui rapitur, nondum mortuus eſt.*
[l] *Etiam qui non morientur, ad incorruptibilitatem transferentur.*
[m] *Nonnulli nè morientur quidem.*

num. 148. and in his epiſtle to Minerius and Alexander, bringeth the ſaying of Chriſt (Matth. 24. 37, &c.) of the dayes of Noah, when the floud ſwept them away, as they were eating and drinking; to prove that at the laſt judgement ſome ſhall not die. Theodoret evinceth the ſame truth, producing the paſſage of Matth. 24. 40. of two in the field; one aſſumed, the other rejected. And Chryſoſtom, in his Sermon *de Aſcenſione Domini*, inſtanceth in the verſe following, of two in a mill; one refuſed, the other accepted: which proofs aim at this, That all ſhall not die. Cajetan is rich in proofs, That all ſhall not die: See him on Act. 10. upon Timoth. 4. upon 1. Corinth. 15. upon 1. Theſſal. 4. Tertullians words muſt not be omitted, in his book *de reſurrectione carnis*; [n] *This gracious priviledge belongs unto thoſe, who at the coming of our Lord and Saviour to judgement ſhall be found alive upon earth: and for the grievous afflictions and preſſures of the times under Antichriſt they ſhall have granted unto them this indulgence, That they ſhall not die, but ſhall be ſuddenly changed, and ſo go to meet Chriſt together with thoſe which ſhall then be raiſed from the dead.*

[n] *Hujus gratiæ privilegium illos manet, qui ab adventu Domini, deprehendentur in carn:: &, propter duritias temporum Antichriſti, merebuntur, compendio mortis per demutationem expunctæ, concurrere cum reſurgentibus.*

Salmeron being peremptorie, That all and every one ſhall die properly, upon 1. Theſſal. 4. hath a wilde crotchet, That all, who ſhall be alive toward the end of the world, ſhall be conſumed with the fire of conflagration, which ſhall go before Chriſt; and ſo dead and raiſed ſhall be ſnatched up. But S. Auguſtine, *de Civitat. Dei*, 20. 16. ſetting down the order of the laſt judgement, ſaith, *The fire of conflagration ſhall be after the laſt judgement.*

I will cloſe this point, with the ſound and learned words of Calvin, (which fully accord, with what I reſted on, in the beginning of this chapter) upon 1. Corinth. 15. [o] *Since there cannot be a change* (ſaith he,) *but the former nature muſt be aboliſhed; the very change, on good grounds, may juſtly be accounted a kinde of death: but ſince there is not a ſeparation of the ſoul from the bodie, it is not to be reputed as if it were the common and ordinarie death.* Upon 1. Theſſal. 4. he wittily obſerveth, that they [p] *who are dead, or do die, for ſome ſpace of time or other (longer or ſhorter) their ſouls put off the ſubſtantiall clothing of the bodie or fleſh: but they who ſhall be changed, ſhall put off onely the qualitie, not the ſubſtance.*

[o] *Cùm mutatio fieri nequeat, quin aboleatur prior natura; ipſa mutatio meritò cenſetur ſpecies mortis: ſed cùm non ſit anima à corpore ſolutio, non reputatur in morte ordinaria.*

[p] *Qui dormiunt, aliquo temporis ſpatio exuunt corporis ſubſtantiam; qui immutabuntur, non niſi qualitatem.*

The ſumme of all is this, The third main queſtion, by me at firſt propounded, was, Whether all and every one, without exception, muſt and ſhall die? The Papiſts are obſtinate for the affirmative; I have proved the negative, That ſome may be, ſome have been, and ſome others ſhall be excepted, and not die. And ſo I end my third and laſt Chapter of my third book of Miſcellanies.

he needed not. Whereupon, *de Civitat.* 20. 20. he ſaith, [a] *Death goeth before; a moſt ſhort and ſpeedie one, yet a death.* And in the ſame place, [b] *They ſhall ſlip, ſail, or paſſe over by death to immortalitie with wonderfull ſpeed.* Again, *de peccat. merit. & remiſſ.* 2. 31. [c] *God at the end of the world ſhall grant this priviledge unto ſome, That by reaſon of their ſudden change they ſhall not feel death.* And, *Retract.* 2. 33. [d] *Either they die not, or otherwiſe they glide from this life into death, and from death into eternall life, as it were, in the twinkling of an eye, by a moſt ſpeedie alteration, taking no notice or ſenſe of death.* He leaves it doubtfull (as you ſee) in theſe his laſt books: though ſometimes before he thought, That all ſhould die; and otherwhere, as *ad Dulcitium, quæſt.* 3. That they ſhould not die.

The Maſter of the Sentences ſaith concerning the queſtion, Whether the change be by death, or without it, [e] *Man cannot determine certainly which of theſe is trueſt.* Rabanus, *lib.* 4. *de ſermon. proprietat.* having alledged the conſent of divers Fathers to eſtabliſh his own opinion, *That all muſt die*; yet annexeth this, *Becauſe there are others alike Catholick and learned men, who beleeve, That, the ſoul remaining in the bodie, thoſe ſhall be changed to immortalitie, who ſhall be found alive at the coming of our Lord*; [f] *and that it ſtands them in ſtead of riſing from the dead, that they caſt away mortalitie by change, not by death; Let any man reſt on which opinion he pleaſeth, &c.* Which very words alſo, you ſhall finde in the book *de Eccleſiaſt. Dogmat. cap.* 7. Now though S. Auguſtine was dubious, and ſome with him; and though ſome alſo have imbraced the contrary opinion: yet equally Catholick and learned men have been conſtant to maintain, That ſome ſhall not *die*, but be *changed*; as you have heard confeſſed.

If you pleaſe, you may take a view of ſome, more particularly. The afore named Theodorus Heracleotes, cited by Hierom, in his epiſtle to Minerius and Alexander, hath it thus; [i] *The Saints, who in the day of the laſt judgement ſhall be found to be alive and remain in their earthly bodies, ſhall not ſee death, or taſte of it; and ſhall be with the Lord, kicking and ſpurning at death and the greateſt inforcing neceſſitie thereof.* Apollinaris, cited in the ſame epiſtle, ſaid, *Some ſhall not die; but be ſnatcht out of this life, that with changed, and glorified bodies, they might be with Chriſt.* Chryſoſtom on the 10. to the Romanes, and on 1. Theſſ. 4. and upon this place to the Corinthians, ſaith, *Some ſhall eſcape death.* With him agreeth Epiphanius, *Hæreſi* 64. ſaying, [k] *Who is ſuddenly ſnatched up, is not yet dead.* And before them, Origen, *lib.* 2. *contra Celſum*, ſo opineth. Theophylact on 1. Corinth. 15. thus, [l] *Even they who ſhall not die, ſhall be tranſchanged out of this corruptible life, to incorruptibilitie:* And again, [m] *Some indeed ſhall not die at all.* To that effect S. Hierom in his epiſtle to Marcella, *quæſt.* 3. *num.*

[a] *Dormitio præcedit, quamvis breviſſima, non tamen nulla.*
[b] *Per mortem ad immortalitatem mirâ celeritate tranſibunt.*
[c] *Hoc quibuſdam in fine largietur Deus, ut mortem iſtam repentinâ commutatione non ſentiant.*
[d] *Aut non morientur, aut de vita iſta in mortem, & de morte in æternam vitam, celerrimâ commutatione, tanquam in ictu oculi tranſeundo, mortem non ſenticut.*
[e] *Horum quid ſit verius, non eſt humani judicii definire.*
[f] *Et hoc eis reputari pro reſurrectione ex mortuis, quòd mortalitatem immutatione deponant, non morte, &c.*
[i] *Sancti, qui in die judicii in corporibus reperiendi ſunt, non guſtabunt mortem; eruntque cum Domino, graviſſimâ mortis neceſſitate calcatâ.*
[k] *Qui rapitur, nondum mortuus eſt.*
[l] *Etiam qui non morientur, ad incorruptibilitatem transferentur.*
[m] *Nonnulli nè morientur quidem.*

num. 148. and in his epiſtle to Minerius and Alexander, bringeth the ſaying of Chriſt (Matth. 24. 37, &c.) of the dayes of Noah, when the floud ſwept them away, as they were eating and drinking; to prove that at the laſt judgement ſome ſhall not die. Theodoret evinceth the ſame truth, producing the paſſage of Matth. 24. 40. of two in the field; one aſſumed, the other rejected. And Chryſoſtom, in his Sermon *de Aſcenſione Domini*, inſtanceth in the verſe following, of two in a mill; one refuſed, the other accepted: which proofs aim at this, That all ſhall not die. Cajetan is rich in proofs, That all ſhall not die: See him on Act. 10. upon Timoth. 4. upon 1. Corinth. 15. upon 1. Theſſal. 4. Tertullians words muſt not be omitted, in his book *de reſurrectione carnis*; [n] *This gracious priviledge belongs unto thoſe, who at the coming of our Lord and Saviour to judgement ſhall be found alive upon earth: and for the grievous afflictions and preſſures of the times under Antichriſt they ſhall have granted unto them this indulgence, That they ſhall not die, but ſhall be ſuddenly changed, and ſo go to meet Chriſt together with thoſe which ſhall then be raiſed from the dead.*

[n] *Hujus gratiæ privilegium illos manet, qui ab adventu Domini, deprehendentur in carn:: &, propter duritias temporum Antichriſti, merebuntur, compendio mortis per demutationem expunctæ, concurrere cum reſurgentibus.*

Salmeron being peremptorie, That all and every one ſhall die properly, upon 1. Theſſal. 4. hath a wilde crotchet, That all, who ſhall be alive toward the end of the world, ſhall be conſumed with the fire of conflagration, which ſhall go before Chriſt; and ſo dead and raiſed ſhall be ſnatched up. But S. Auguſtine, *de Civitat. Dei*, 20. 16. ſetting down the order of the laſt judgement, ſaith, *The fire of conflagration ſhall be after the laſt judgement.*

I will cloſe this point, with the ſound and learned words of Calvin, (which fully accord, with what I reſted on, in the beginning of this chapter) upon 1. Corinth. 15. [o] *Since there cannot be a change* (ſaith he,) *but the former nature muſt be aboliſhed; the very change, on good grounds, may juſtly be accounted a kinde of death: but ſince there is not a ſeparation of the ſoul from the bodie, it is not to be reputed as if it were the common and ordinarie death.* Upon 1. Theſſal. 4. he wittily obſerveth, that they [p] *who are dead, or do die, for ſome ſpace of time or other (longer or ſhorter) their ſouls put off the ſubſtantiall clothing of the bodie or fleſh: but they who ſhall be changed, ſhall put off onely the qualitie, not the ſubſtance.*

[o] *Cùm mutatio fieri nequeat, quin aboleatur prior natura; ipſa mutatio meritò cenſetur ſpecies mortis: ſed cùm non ſit anima à corpore ſolutio, non reputatur in morte ordinaria.*

[p] *Qui dormiunt, aliquo temporis ſpatio exuunt corporis ſubſtantiam; qui innovabuntur, non niſi qualitatem.*

The ſumme of all is this, The third main queſtion, by me at firſt propounded, was, Whether all and every one, without exception, muſt and ſhall die? The Papiſts are obſtinate for the affirmative; I have proved the negative, That ſome may be, ſome have been, and ſome others ſhall be excepted, and not die. And ſo I end my third and laſt Chapter of my third book of Miſcellanies.

O Most gracious Lord God, who haſt committed all judgement to thy onely ſonne, our onely Lord and Saviour; I beſeech thee to have pitie upon me, and for Jeſus Chriſt his ſake, receive me into thy eſpeciall favour. O bleſſed Jesu, accept of theſe my poore and weak endeavours; and receive my prayers, and preſent them with mercie to the throne of Grace: haſten thy coming, and thy kingdome: Come ſweet Jesu, come quickly: and prepare my ſoul, to meet thee with joy. If it be thy holy will, let me be one of them, that ſhall be changed, and changed to the better: from *pain* to *comfort*, from *ſickneſſe*, *ſorrow*, and *labour*, to *reſt*, and *bleſſedneſſe eternall*. Amen. Amen. Amen.

UNI-TRINO DEO LAUS, ET GLORIA.

FINIS.

BRITISH
20JY74
MUSEUM

An Alphabeticall Table of the principall things contained in theſe three Books of Miſcellanies.

A

A Bortion is a curſe. Book 1. pag. 103. *Two kindes of Abortives.* ibid. pag. 98,99.

Adams body was created immortall; and how. ibid.p.11. *Adams body was framed of other duſt, then the duſt of Paradiſe.* ibid.p.16. viz. *out of the red earth of* ager Damaſcenus.ibid.p. 85. & Book 2.p.23. *The contrarie diſpoſition of Elements had not cauſed a diſſolution of Adams body, had Adam ſtood.* Book 1.p.17, *to* 28. *The naturall temper and conſtitution of Adams body in ſtate of innocencie.* ibid.p.18, *and* 20. *Whether if Adam and Eve had ſtood confirmed in innocencie, any of their children could have ſinned.* ibid.p.44, *to* 54. *The endowments of Adam in ſtate of innocencie,* ib.p. 55,56. *Whether Adam and Eve foreknew their fall.* ibid.p.59. *Whether Adam and Eves ſinne were the ſame.* ibid.p.61. *Whether of their ſinnes were the greater.* ibid.p.62,65, *to* 73. *where alſo of Adams firſt ſinne by which he fell.* ibid. *Adam mourned* 100 *yeares for the murdered Abel.* ibid.p.85,87. *Adam was a type of Chriſt; therefore ſaved.* ibid. *Adam was buried in Golgotha, and his skull found upon mount Calvary.* Book 2. *from* p.13, *to* 29. *Whether Adam could naturally underſtand all languages.* ibid. p. 47, 48.

Amphibologie prejudiciall to truth. Book 1. p.2.

Angels fell the ſecond inſtant of their creation. ib.p.108, *and* 126. *Chriſt merited for Angels.* ib.p.189,190. *Angels repreſenting men are called men in the Scripture.* Book 2. *chap.* 16.

Apocryphall books too much ſlighted. Book 2.p.145. *They are to be preferred before any other humane Authours.* Book 3. p.183.

Of the diverſe Appointment of things by God. Book 1. p.2,3.

The Apoſtles repreſented the whole body of Chriſts Miniſters. ibid. p.147,148. *The Apoſtles were none of them learned before their calling.* Book 2. p.87,88.

Ariſtotle and Plato compared. Book 1. p. 13, 14, 15.

The Aſcenſion of Chriſt repreſented in the aſſumption of Enoch and Elias. Book 3. p.191, *to* 195.

B

BEauty deſired. Book 1. pag.19.

The Being, or not Being of a thing may be ſaid divers wayes. Book 2. p.77.

Briſtoll built of old by Brennus. ibid. p. 23,24.

C

WHence the Capitol in Rome had its name. B. 2. pag.18.

Ceremonies Leviticall died at firſt by degrees; and now they are not onely dead, but deadly. Book 1. p.3.

There is no Chance where Providence reigneth. Book 2. p.71,72.

The Table.

Cherubims with reall flaming ſwords were placed in Paradiſe. Book 1. p. 2,3. *and why.* ibid. p. 23.

Chriſts beautie in his humanitie deſcribed, together with his Paſsion. B. 1. p. 18, 19, 20. *compare* ibid. p. 193. *Chriſt doth us more good then Adam did us harm.* ibid. p. 185, *to* 188. *Chriſt ſaved more in number then Adam condemned.* ibid. p. 188, 189. *&c. Whether Chriſt were in Adam; and how.* ibid. p. 82, 83.

The judgement of the eſſentiall Church of Chriſt is infallible. ibid. p. 148.

Circumciſion of women by the Turks. ibid. p. 144.

A wicked Companion is very dangerous. Book 3. p. 184, 185.

Conception what it is, and how. B. 1. p. 93, *to* 99.

Confirmation in grace is of two ſorts. ibid. p. 48.

Generall Councels are the higheſt earthly Judges of Scriptures controverſed. ibid. p. 136, 148.

D

Death is threefold. Book 1. p. 4. *Death is common to all.* ibid. *Death Naturall, and Violent.* ibid. p. 17. *Sinne is the onely cauſe of Death.* ibid. p. 26, 27. *Death is bitter, becauſe painfull.* ibid. pag. 28, 31. *Death is ſweet to ſome men, becauſe God makes it beneficiall unto them.* ibid. pag. 32, 33, &c. *Death was inflicted on Adam for one ſinne.* ibid. *Death was inflicted for the ſinne of the man Adam, not of the woman Eve.* ibid. pag. 36, to 44. *Speedy death by ſome is accounted beſt.* Book 3. pag. 187. *Whether all Adams poſteritie, without priviledge or exception, muſt, and ſhall die.* Book 3. *Chap.* 1, 2, 3, *throughout.*

The difference between Δικαίωμα *and* Δικαίωσις. Book 1. pag. 192, 193, &c.

Diſciples of Chriſt were none of them Noble, at leaſt not Nobly bred. Book 2. pag. 86.

E

Of the Eaſt-Indians and their language. Book 3. p. 204.

Of Elias and Enoch, whether they be yet living or dead. Book 3. *Chap.* 2. *throughout. Divers queſtions about Enoch more eſpecially.* ibid. p. 181, 182, &c.

Equivocation in what ſenſe, and in what caſes it may be allowable. Book 1. pag. 165, 167.

The ſecond book of Eſdras was never held Canonicall. ibid. p. 7.

Eve remained an intemerate virgin untill after the ſinne of Adam. ib. p. 39, 40. *Whether Eve ſinned before ſhe talked with the ſerpent.* ibid. pag. 60.

Excommunication was of three ſorts in the Jewiſh politie. Book 2. pag. 48, 49.

F

The word Father *is diverſly taken in the holy Scripture.* Book 1. pag. 120. *and* Book 2. pag. 113, &c.

G

Genealogies were ever drawn from the Males. Book 1. page 40, 41.

H

He Healed by Chriſt were never a ſecond time cured of any diſeaſe. Book 2. p. 8.

Heavenly influences, which are noxious, are the cauſes of much ſickneſſe and deſtruction. Book 1. p. 17.

All

The Table.

All languages have ſome words retaining the foot-ſteps of the Hebrew. Book 2. p. 45. *When the Hebrew points were firſt uſed.* Book 1. p. 100, 101, 102.

Hebron the citie. Book 2. page 19, *to* 29.

Humilitie. ibid. p. 161, 162. *The humilitie of S. Paul.* Book 2. p. 84, 85.

The Husband repreſents the wife. Book 1. p. 140.

I

JEr. 10. 11. *was the onely verſe of his whole propheſie, that was written in Chaldee; which every captive Jew was commanded to caſt in the teeth of the Babylonians.* Book 1. *p.* 180.

Jeruſalem the holy citie. Book 2. *p.* 154, 155, 156.

Ignorance threefold. Book 1. *p.* 60.

Interpretation of Scriptures is the Paſtours right, with whom the Laitie muſt conſult. ibid. p. 149, 150, 156, 181, 182. *&* Book 2. *p.* 63. *Interpretation of Scriptures by Anagrams is profane.* B. 1. *p.* 152, 153. *Whether interpretation of Scriptures, or judgement of doctrine do in any ſort belong unto the people; and how farre.* ibid. *p.* 157, 159. *Helps and cautions preſcribed unto the people for interpretation of Scriptures.* ibid. *pag.* 160, *to pag.* 169, &c.

John the Apoſtle his death. Book 3. *p.* 187, 188, 189.

Joſeph was the firſt-born of Jacob. Book 1. p. 142, 143. *Joſeph was a type of Chriſt.* Book 2. *p.* 33.

A twofold acception of the word Judgement. Book 1. p. 6. *Judgement after death is private, of ſouls; publick, of bodies and ſouls.* ibid.

K.

KIngs repreſent the people under them. Book 1. *p.* 183, 184. *Of the honour due unto the King.* ibid.

Whether Korah, Dathan, and Abiram deſcended with all their goods truly into hell. Book 3. p. 214, 215, *to* p. 221.

L

WHerein the confuſion of Languages conſiſted. Book 2. p. 45, 46. *Orientall languages conduce much to the underſtanding of Scriptures: therefore neceſſarie to be ſtudied.* ib. p. 48. *Of the ſame languages alſo.* B. 3. p. 204, 205.

Of Lazarus raiſed by Chriſt. Book 2. p. 7, 8, 9.

Humane Learning is an handmaid to Divinitie. ib. p. 88, 89.

Literall ſenſe of Scripture is hardeſt to be found. Book 1. p. 149.

M

MAgiſtrates not to be reviled. Book 1. p. 168, 169, 170.

Maran-atha expounded. Book 2. p. 48, *to* p. 54.

Of Melchiſedech, and why he is ſaid to be without father and mother. Book 3. p. 201, 202, &c. *to* p. 206.

Members of the bodie are not all of equall worth. Book 1. p. 63.

God is very Merciſull unto all. ib. p. 186, 187.

Whether Moſes at the Transfiguration appeared in his own true perſon, or not. Book 3. p. 208, 209, &c.

O

IN Oaths we muſt be warie of mentall reſervations, and unlawfull equivocations. Book 1. p. 166, 167.

Opinion. Book 2. p. 83.

Originall ſinne. See Sinne.

P

OF Paradiſe. Book 3. pag. 194, 195, 196, 197.

The Table.

The Paſtours wiſdome, both for the matter and manner of his doctrine. Book 1. p. 158.

The Patriarchs were buried in Sychem. Book 2. chap. 10.

Meerly Perſonalls are not propagated. B. 1. p. 109, *to* p. 138.

S. Peter repreſented all the Apoſtles, Joh. 21. 15, 16. Book 1. p. 147.

The Pope is ſervus ſervorum Dei. ibid. p. 132.

The Priviledges of a few make not a law. Book 2. p. 160.

Whether God may juſtly Puniſh the Fathers for the childrens actuall delinquencies. B. 1. p. 119, 120. *In what caſes God may, and doth puniſh the children for their Parents faults, either with temporall, or eternall puniſhment.* ib. p. 118, *to* p. 124. *Every individuall man is juſtly puniſhed for originall ſinne in Adam.* ib. p. 145, 146, 147, &c.

R

REdemption was of a double kinde in the Leviticall law. Book 1. p. 143.

Of Reliques, Book 2. chap. 12. *and the Authours eſteem of a true choice Relique.* ibid. p. 130, 131.

The Reſurrection was typified in Samſon; and how. Book 2. p. 31. *Compare* Book 3. p. 220. *at the bottome of the page. Why all men ſhall riſe again at the laſt day.* Book 1. p. 195. *Whether ſuch as have been raiſed from the dead did die the ſecond time.* Book 2. p. 1, *to* p. 12. *Of holy men there is a double reſurrection.* ib. p. 4. *The raiſing of the dead was an act appropriated unto Chriſt himſelf, no way communicated to his Apoſtles, in his life time.* ib. p. 6, 9, 10. *Who they were that roſe at Chriſts death.* ib. p. 12. *wherwith compare* ib. chap. 8. 11, 12, 13, 14. *throughout. The raiſed Saints aſcended not into heaven with Chriſt.* ib. ch. 15, 16, 17, 18. *throughout. Chriſts reſurrection was typified in Elias,* 2. *King* 2. 13. ib. p. 146.

The figure of Rome at its firſt building. ib. p. 24.

S

THe whole Scripture is but one, though penned by divers. Book 2. p. 38, 39. *The Penmen of the holy Scriptures, as ſuch, could not forget* ibid. p. 40, 41, &c. *Whether, & how it was neceſſarie that the Scripture ſhould be written for mens inſtruction.* ibid. p. 68, 69, 70, &c. *Whether the holy Penmen of the Scriptures underſtood all that they wrote.* ibid. p. 80, *to* p. 86. *Whether they read profane Authours.* ibid. p. 86, *to* p. 90. *They did cite Poets, or profane Authours.* ibid. p. 89, *to* p. 93. *Whether they ſtudied the things they wrote beforehand.* ib. p. 92, *to* p. 96. *There was no difference between the Penmen of the divine Writ of the Old and New Teſtament in the point of conceiving, and writing in different languages.* ib. p. 96. *We muſt have recourſe unto the alluſions of Scripture which are, not reſt on what the Apoſtles conceived in their mindes onely.* ibid. p. 97. *The Penmen of Scripture had no libertie to put in their own conceits, or, in writing to adde, or blot out what they had done.* ib. p. 98, *to* p. 104. *They had no power to clothe their inward apprehenſions with words of their own.* ib. p. 104, 105, 106. *The Penmen of Scripture wrote their heavenly dictates in the ſame language, in which they conceived them.* ibid. p. 107, *to* p. 112. *Whether the holy Penmen of Scripture*

The Table.

pture wrote the Scripture casually. ibid. p. 71, 72. *When the New Testament began first to be written, and upon what occasion.* ibid. pag. 73. *Whether the Penmen of Scripture were commanded to write.* ibid. p. 73, *to* page 76. *Whether the Prophets, Evangelists, and Apostles were compelled to write.* ibid. 76, *to* p. 80. *Whether Christ wrote any part of Scripture himself immediately.* ibid. p. 64, 65, &c.

Why Sinne is called Originall. Book 1. p. 129. *Styles given to originall sinne.* ib. p. 36. *Some sinnes are greater then other.* ibid. p. 62, 63, 64. *The greatnesse of a sinne is two wayes considered.* ibid. p. 66. *Of originall sinne, as conveyed unto us from Adam.* ib. p. 74, *to* pag. 90. *Originall sinne is matter of repentance.* ib. p. 76. *How we sinned originall sinne in Adam.* ib. p. 78, 79, 80. *Not by imputation onely, nor onely by imitation.* p. 84, 85. *Originall sinne is propagated to mankinde.* ib. p. 90, 91. & p. 129. *When originall sinne beginneth.* ib. p. 91, 92, 93. *The manner how the soul is by it made sinfull.* ib. p. 103, *to* p. 109. *Adams actuall sinne was private, and personall, ideall onely, and representative: therefore not imputed unto us.* ib. p. 88, 89. & p. 129.

The foure principall faculties of our Souls, with their severall objects. Book 1. p. 56.

T

A *Twofold kinde of Temperature, the one of weight, the other of justice.* Book 1. p. 18.

Tithes are by an everlasting law due to the Priesthood of Melchisedech. ibid. p. 83. *Curses that follow those who sacrilegiously rob the Church of Tithes.* Book. 2. p. 50, 51.

The Transfiguration of Christ, with the manner of it, and how it was not painfull to him. B. 1. p. 29.

Of the Translation of them who shall be found alive at the last day ibid. p. 30.

The use of the Tree of life in Paradise unto Adam. ibid. p. 20, & 23. *Whether Adam did eat of the tree of life before he fell.* ibid. p. 21, 22.

V

Viator *is considered according unto a twofold estate.* Book 1. page 51, 52.

FINIS.

BRITISH
20 JY 74
MUSEUM

The ſeverall places of Scripture explained in theſe three Books of Miſcellanies.

The firſt book.

Gen. 3. 20. *pag.* 40.
Gen. 4. 15. 64, 65.
Exod. 13. 2. 140.
Exod. 20. 5. 110, 116, 127, 128.
Job 14. 4. 95, 96.
Pſ. 51. 5. 92, 93, 94.
Pſ. 91. 11. 25, 26.
Pſ. 109. 14. 121, 122.
Pſ. 131. 1. 161, 162.
Iſa. 53. 2. 18.
Verſ. 4. 20.
Jer. 25. 26. 153, *unto* 157.
Matt. 15. 14. 174.
Joh. 8. 44. 37.
Joh. 9. 2. 132.
Act. 23. 5. 168, 169, 170, &c.
Rom. 5. 12. 79, 80.
verſ. 13. 186.
ver. 18. *from page* 190, *to the end of the firſt book.*
Rom. 11. 16. 106.
1. Cor. 3. 1, 2. 158.
1. Cor. 7. 14. 106.
1. Cor. 15. 47. 42.
Epheſ. 4. 23, 24. 56.
Heb. 9. 27. *from the* 1, *to the ninth.*

The ſecond book.

Gen. 22. 5. p. 83.
Gen. 31. 53. 32.
John 8. 56. 30, 31.
Joh. 20. 7. 146, 147.
1. Cor. 9. 16. 78.
1. Cor. 16. 22. 48, 49, &c.
2. Cor. 5. 14. 78.
Gal. 6. 11. 67, 68.
Heb. 11. 35. 4.

The third book.

Exod. 34. 29. p. 210.
Mal. 4. 5, 6. 174, 175, &c.
Matt. 17. 11. 177, 178, &c.

¶ Faults escaped in the first Book, thus to be corrected.

Page	line				
18	11	for	*proportion*	reade	*proportio.*
20	margin		ἀλλὲν		ἀλλ' ἐν.
24	2		tree life		tree of life.
29	13		*not*		*no.*
	39		ecclipsed		eclipsed.
30	margin		*tran-seuntis*		*transeuntis.*
32	margin		*laborantos*		*laborantes.*
44	20		yae		yea.
57	20		he did for a while		he did fulfill for a while.
62	22		Cittien		Citizen.
65	30		*Wheter*		*Whether.*
	43		Genſis		Geneſis.
82	41		*liſieneſſe*		*likeneſſe.*
86	20		this		his.
96	margin		*doctus, nec doctus*		*doctus, nec indoctus.*

¶ In the second Book.

2	39	for iſtance	reade	inſtance.

FINIS.

BRITISH
20JY74
MUSEUM